

## MAINE.

Oscar H. Dilworth, Madison.  
James L. Foster, Livermore Falls.  
Franklin K. Jack, Bowdoinham.  
Theodore C. Haley, Rangeley.  
Frederick W. Hartnett, Bath.  
Edward Lynch, South Berwick.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Sheppard Lamar Martin, Wiggins.  
Emma L. Whyte, Bond.

## MONTANA.

Lawrence C. Porter, Winifred.  
Meta W. Shaw, Terry.  
George E. Shawler, Geraldine.

## NEBRASKA.

O. C. Lamb, Guide Rock.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward S. Perkins, Sunapee.  
Samuel Runlett, Durham.  
Joseph Warren, Rochester.

## NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Edward Charles, Wenonah.  
Charles G. Hatcher, Smithville.

## NEVADA.

E. M. George, Battle Mountain.  
Laura Hoegh, Eureka.  
George W. Likes, Fallon.  
James J. McQuillan, Tonopah.  
Thomas D. Rogers, Manhattan.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Abraham T. Anderson, Turtle Lake.  
John E. Dick, McVile.  
Gilbert M. Eng, Douglas.  
Harriet M. Frank, Powers Lake.  
H. M. Haakenson, Hatton.  
William F. L. Makee, Noonan.

## OHIO.

Joel C. Clore, Cincinnati.

## OKLAHOMA.

J. L. Buckley, Texhoma.  
Thomas B. Dunlap, Ringling.  
Charley M. Foil, Jennings.  
J. A. Miller, Beaver.

## OREGON.

T. J. Anderson, Harrisburg.  
James W. Dunn, St. Benedict.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

William L. Marshall, Dayton.

## RHODE ISLAND.

Sumner Mowry, Peace Dale.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.  
W. F. McGuigan, McIntosh.  
J. W. McMahon, Salem.

## TEXAS.

W. F. Lancaster, Bowie.  
Osceola G. Wilson, Nixon.

## VERMONT.

Frank H. Clark, Windsor.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 17, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, because we believe in Thee as the final cause, the source from whom proceedeth all things, and we most fervently pray that we may be susceptible to the Holy Spirit ever emanating from Thee, that Thy kingdom may come in our hearts and Thy will be done in our lives. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 15, 1916, was read and approved.

## SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The credentials of Mr. W. W. VENABLE, the newly elected Member from Mississippi, are on the Speaker's

table, signed by the governor and secretary of state in the regular form.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I present Mr. VENABLE and ask that he be sworn in.

Mr. VENABLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the father-in-law of my son is dead at my house, and I feel that I ought to ask leave of absence for to-day. I wish to say that there are a number of bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent reported from the committee of which I am chairman. The authors and the gentlemen who reported those bills are here and are able to take care of them. I request leave of absence for to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks leave of absence for to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

## ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION, VICKSBURG, MISS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to all of these bills to-day on this Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question? I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. It seems to me the gentleman from Minnesota would determine that, but in any event the Chair will put the request. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas catechizing the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was going to object to all of the bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent?

Mr. LINDBERGH. All of these that are here; yes.

Mr. GARNER. Then, I suggest that it is not necessary to call these bills for unanimous consent if the gentleman gives notice now that he intends to object to all of them, unless the Chair is going to recognize Members in charge of bills to suspend the rules and pass them.

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair is going to do.

Mr. COLLIER. Then I will make that motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FERRIS. Has not the gentleman to wait until the bills are called through the calendar?

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from Mississippi moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4954, with committee amendments.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to make that point. Evidently there is not a quorum here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Driscoll	Hulbert	Patten
Bacharach	Drukker	Hutchinson	Porter
Barchfeld	Dupré	Jones	Powers
Beales	Dyer	Keister	Reilly
Bennet	Fairchild	Kent	Riordan
Brown, W. Va.	Farley	Kless, Pa.	Sabath
Bruckner	Flynn	Kitchin	Scott, Pa.
Buchanan, Tex.	Focht	Kreider	Scully
Caldwell	Gallagher	Lafean	Sells
Carew	Gallivan	Leib	Sherley
Casey	Garland	Leibel	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham	Linthicum	Slomp
Chipperfield	Gray, Ala.	Loft	Stedman
Coady	Gray, N. J.	Longworth	Summers
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Guernsey	Maher	Talbot
Darrow	Hamill	Mays	Ward
Davenport	Haskell	Miller, Pa.	Whaley
Dempsey	Haugen	Mooney	Williams, W. B.
Dies	Hilliard	Morgan, La.	Winslow
Dooling	Holland	Nolan	Wise
Doremus	Howell	Paine, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 346 Members, a quorum, responded to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4954) as amended, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to convey by deed to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., a small tract of land for cemetery purposes, which land is now part of the Vicksburg National Military Park, and more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of a tract of land as described in deed book C C, page 611, in chancery clerk's office, Warren County, Miss.; thence with an astronomical azimuth 100° 40' 992 feet to a stone post; thence 209° 10' 509 feet to a stone post; thence 225° 55' 461 feet to a stone post; thence 220° 50' 398 feet to a stone post on the south side of the Baldwin Ferry Road; thence 296° 10' 198 feet; thence 355° 10' 105 feet; thence 23° 15' 178 feet to the point of beginning.

Thence with an astronomical azimuth no degrees and 15' 534 feet; thence 270° 15' 318½ feet; thence 132° 5' 251 feet; thence 171° 20' 259 feet; thence 134° 25' 143 feet to the point of beginning; containing 1.64 acres, more or less, and being part of section 21, township 16, range 4 east: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois to 20 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I think I can get through discussing this bill in much less than the 20 minutes of time allotted to me. In fact, the report accompanying the bill states the facts as completely as I could, but to save you the trouble of reading that fine print I will state briefly, for your information, the following:

When the Vicksburg Military Park was established it was found that the Anshe Chesed Congregation Cemetery was stationed near the place where the old fortifications were, and that some of this land was needed to complete the park. In 1900 the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of land—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What was the name of the cemetery?

Mr. COLLIER. The Anshe Chesed, the Jewish cemetery at the city of Vicksburg. Through their patriotic desire to see that great work perpetuated the congregation gave to the Federal Government 19.5 acres of their cemetery for a nominal consideration. They wanted to give it for nothing, but it was given for a nominal consideration of \$1 and the moving of a fence.

It now seems, gentlemen, that they gave more of their cemetery than they should, because they now need more room, and they come and ask the Federal Government to reconvey to them 1.64 acres. There is no objection to this from any source that I have found. The land that is being asked to be reconveyed has no special significance in that it is commemorated by a tablet, memorial, or marker. The chairman of the park commission, Capt. W. T. Rigby, has recommended that this 1.64 acres be conveyed back to that congregation, but the Judge Advocate General has stated—and you will find it in the report—that the War Department has no authority to reconvey that land, but that we will have to come to Congress to get that authority. Judge Crowder states that the War Department will favor any congressional legislation looking to that end, which opinion is concurred in by the Acting Secretary of War.

Now, another point. It might be suggested as to what effect this will have upon the appearance of that park. It will simply be moving a fence down a short distance, and any effect it will have will be that of still more beautifying the park, because they will add more monuments therein.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, except I wish to bring this out, that the committee has made an amendment that this transfer shall be made at no cost to the United States, which amendment was, of course, accepted by the author of the bill and is entirely satisfactory to the congregation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. From what committee did the bill come?

Mr. COLLIER. This bill comes from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second in order that the matter might be explained to the House. I have myself no opposition to the bill. If anyone desires a part of my time in opposition to the bill, I will yield to him, otherwise I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Washington delegation, Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver a lecture on "The necessity for water-power development" at the new National Museum, at the foot of Tenth Street NW., on to-morrow evening at 8.30. I have heard this lecture of Mr. Pierce upon this very important proposition. It contains a vast amount of information, and Mr. Pierce is certainly one of the best-posted men on this question in the United States. In addition to his lecture he will show moving pictures of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. I call special attention to this as bearing on this question of preparedness. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this invitation of the Washington delegation in the RECORD, so that Members may see it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert the invitation mentioned in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The invitation is as follows:

At the request of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington Mr. Henry J. Pierce, of Seattle, Wash., will deliver his lecture entitled "The Necessity for Water-Power Development" in the auditorium of the new National Museum, B Street, foot of Tenth Street NW., on Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 8.30 p. m., illustrated by moving pictures.

The Members of Congress and their families and others to whom this is addressed are cordially invited to be present.

This procedure is prompted by the critical importance of this subject at this session of Congress. Among the many important matters which are dependent upon water-power development is the establishment of the nitrogen industry. Nitrogen is necessary to our national defense and to our agricultural welfare. We are now dependent upon foreign sources, which may be cut off in time of need. Among the motion pictures shown by Mr. Pierce are those of the great nitrogen establishments of Norway and Canada. It is believed that a general attendance by Members of Congress will prove exceedingly valuable and timely in connection with the legislative consideration that must be given to a Federal water-power policy at this session of Congress.

WESLEY L. JONES.  
MILES POINDEXTER.  
W. E. HUMPHREY.  
ALBERT JOHNSON.  
W. L. LA FOLLETTE.  
L. H. HADLEY.  
C. C. DILL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

#### BIRTHDAY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains to national memorials, which enables me to say the few words I desire to say to the House this morning on a kindred subject.

Mr. Speaker, contemporaneous history does not always record that which is great in our citizenship. We are periodically boastful and are sometimes addicted to hero worship, but that which is truly great in our men and women is too often permitted to pass without that recognition which is the sweetest reward of achievement. The definition of a statesman attributed to Thomas B. Reed, a truly great Speaker of the House of Representatives, will serve best to illustrate the thought in mind. "A statesman," he said, "is a successful politician who is dead."

I am prompted to make these observations this morning because, with the indulgence of the House, I shall speak briefly of Benjamin Franklin, one of the truly great Americans who has come to be recognized the world over as the greatest of our philosophers. To-day is the two hundred and tenth anniversary of the birth of Franklin in the city of Boston. The major part of the 84 years of his life were spent in the district in Philadelphia which I have the honor to represent. When he was not laboring in that district as a practical printer or in working out the many problems which placed him a century ahead of the geniuses of public thought and benefaction he was performing for the American colonists those admirable feats of diplomacy in the courts of Great Britain and France which commanded a respect for American characteristics that in later years we have come to refer to proudly as "American institutions."

It would be idle, however, in the few minutes I am permitted to speak to attempt a eulogy, much less a review, of the life and works of Benjamin Franklin. I have in mind only to say that his mortal remains, now long since turned to dust, lie under a marble slab—provision for which was made by his own will—in old Christ Church burial ground at Fifth and Arch Streets, Philadelphia. It would not be fair to the American people of April 17, 1790, when Benjamin Franklin died, to say that they



did not mourn his loss, for they did. He had asked for a plain funeral, and had designated the maker of the stone and the inscription that should go upon it to mark the last resting place of his wife Deborah and himself; but the people of Philadelphia and such distinguished visitors as could appear at the obsequies turned out in goodly numbers and with much formality to honor the man whom they had come to respect and admire. The greatness of Franklin as a world figure, however, had not then fully dawned upon them. It was perhaps more in the Old World, notably in France, that Franklin's fame was heralded, even as one who had brought a new light into the world. In England he was not only famous, but, if the stories of the suppression of the manuscript of his autobiography, even as Jefferson has referred to it, be true, he was also feared. He had delivered his message to the world, and that message, although not fully printed or understood until long years after his death, left no doubt as to its meaning or of the world influence of the new Republic in the Western Hemisphere.

But now, Mr. Speaker, a full century and sixteen years having elapsed since the mortal life of Franklin was extinguished, we find in every avenue of thought and activity the light of his philosophy, his truth, and his inventions illuminating the world. The greatness of the individual has been recognized in consequences and effects more durable and more beneficent than even the author of them could have ever hoped for. And yet whether it be due to the ingratitude of succeeding generations or, as is more likely, to their thoughtlessness in the press of the activities generated in the philosophy and thought of Franklin there has been no National, State, nor local memorial erected over his last resting place. There under the stone for which he personally made provision, hemmed in by the towering walls of business structures in the heart of the great city, he lies. Across the street is the identical house in which the American flag was first woven into its present form by the deft fingers of Betsy Ross. Within rifle shot is the scene of his courtship and the incident of the penny loaves to which history refers. The scene of his kite-flying, through which he drew electricity from the clouds, is equally near. The home of the American Philosophical Society, of which he was the president, stands intact two blocks away. And there, also, is Independence Hall, in which he signed the Declaration of Independence and in which he labored, as no other man, to perfect in the Constitution of the United States those provisions which gave us a bicameral form of government.

The sites of the homes of Washington and Morris, his great contemporaries in the establishment of the Union of States, are easily traced a short distance from his grave, and Christ Church, in which Washington and the signers of the Declaration of Independence worshiped and by whose walls some of them lie buried, is still breathing forth its message of hope and sympathy to a religious community. Indeed, in the immediate environment of Franklin's grave, with its fast deteriorating cover of stone, paid for by his own estate, historic landmarks and memories cluster in profuse array.

If at last, Mr. Speaker, we have come to recognize that which was truly great in the wonderful Franklin is it not time, for the sake of his teachings and the influence of his philosophy upon the present generation and of the generations to come, that we celebrate in some national way the worth and the patriotism of this many-sided American? [Applause.]

In the city of Philadelphia he is not forgotten. There are memorials yonder which do honor to his name. On this the anniversary of his birth, the Poor Richard Club, which is now looking forward to a convention of the advertising clubs of the world who honor Franklin as the patron of "The Art Preservative," will lay a chaplet on his grave. Elsewhere in the great City of Brotherly Love tributes will be paid to his memory, notably at the University of Pennsylvania, which owes to him its origin.

But it is not alone for a city or a State to honor Franklin; it should be the grateful task of a Nation the honor and integrity of which he successfully sustained in the courts of the world. [Applause.]

Putting on a practical basis the suggestion just made for a national recognition of Franklin in some such memorial as will signalize the pride of the Nation in his character, I have introduced a bill to which the attention of Congress and the Nation is respectfully invited.

I see by the clock, Mr. Speaker, that a few minutes yet remain of the time kindly allotted to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and in that brief period I wish to read one or two extracts from the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin which was not published until many years after his death. These extracts will show but feebly the many sides of this truly wonderful man, but they will assure us something of the intense humanity that dominated his every action, not only in things

which were political or in the line of statesmanship but in those which pertained to the elevation of mankind generally.

I had, on the whole, abundant reason—

Says Benjamin Franklin—

to be satisfied with my being established in Pennsylvania.

I call attention to this brief specimen of beautiful English, a style that was used by many of the founders of the Republic, and which to a large extent, due to our modern interest and our desire to hit the bull's-eye quicker than our forefathers did, has passed away:

There were, however, two things that I regretted, there being no provision for defense nor for a complete education of youth; no militia, nor any college. I therefore, in 1743, drew up a proposal for establishing an academy; and at that time, thinking the Reverend Mr. Peters, who was out of employ, a fit person to superintend such an institution, I communicated the project to him; but he, having more profitable views in the service of the proprietaries, which succeeded, declined the undertaking; and, not knowing another at that time suitable for such a trust, I let the scheme lie a while dormant. I succeeded better the next year, 1744, in proposing and establishing a Philosophical Society. The paper I wrote for that purpose will be found among my writings when collected.

With respect to defense, Spain having been several years at war against Great Britain, and being at length join'd by France, which brought us into great danger; and the laboured and long-continued endeavour of our governor, Thomas, to prevail with our Quaker Assembly to pass a militia law, and make other provisions for the security of the Province, having proved abortive, I determined to try what might be done by a voluntary association of the people. To promote this, I first wrote and published a pamphlet entitled "Plain Truth," in which I stated our defenseless situation in strong lights, with the necessity of union and discipline for our defense, and promis'd to propose in a few days an association, to be generally signed for that purpose. The pamphlet had a sudden and surprising effect. I was call'd upon for the instrument of association, and having settled the draft of it with a few friends, I appointed a meeting of the citizens in the large building before mentioned. The house was pretty full; I had prepared a number of printed copies, and provided pens and ink dispers'd all over the room. I harangued them a little on the subject, read the paper, and explained it, and then distributed the copies, which were eagerly signed, not the least objection being made.

When the company separated and the papers were collected we found above twelve hundred hands; and, other copies being dispersed in the country, the subscribers amounted at length to upward of ten thousand. These all furnished themselves as soon as they could with arms, formed themselves into companies and regiments, chose their own officers, and met every week to be instructed in the manual exercise and other parts of military discipline. The women, by subscriptions among themselves, provided silk colors, which they presented to the companies, painted with different devices and mottoes, which I supplied.

The officers of the companies composing the Philadelphia regiment, being met, chose me for their colonel; but, conceiving myself unfit, I declin'd that station and recommended Mr. Lawrence, a fine person, a man of influence, who was accordingly appointed. I then propos'd a lottery to defray the expense of building a battery below the town and furnishing it with cannon. It fill'd expeditiously and the battery was soon erected, the merlons being fram'd of logs and fill'd with earth. We bought some old cannon from Boston, but, these not being sufficient, we wrote to England for more, soliciting, at the same time, our proprietaries for some assistance, tho' without much expectation of obtaining it.

Meanwhile Colonel Lawrence, William Allen, Abram Taylor, Esqr., and myself were sent to New York by the associators, commission'd to borrow some cannon of Governor Clinton. He at first refus'd us peremptorily; but at dinner with his council, where there was great drinking of Madeira wine, as the custom of that place then was, he softened by degrees and said he would lend us six. After a few more bumpers he advanc'd to ten, and at length he very good-naturedly conceded eighteen. They were fine cannon, eighteen-pounders, with their carriages, which we soon transported and mounted on our battery, where the associators kept a nightly guard while the war lasted, and among the rest I regularly took my turn of duty there as a common soldier.

There is much more of this to show that they were as intensely human in those days as we are to-day, but that they were even a little more frank about it. [Laughter.]

But having referred to the activities of the Poor Richard Club in celebrating Franklin's birthday, and on this day laying a memorial on his grave, I wish to quote just a few words that Franklin himself said about his creation of the character of Poor Richard:

In 1732 I first publish'd my Almanack, under the name of Richard Saunders; it was continu'd by me about twenty-five years, commonly call'd Poor Richard's Almanack. I endeavor'd to make it both entertaining and useful, and it accordingly came to be in such demand that I reap'd considerable profit from it, vending annually near ten thousand. And observing that it was generally read, scarce any neighborhood in the Province being without it, I consider'd it as a proper vehicle for conveying instruction among the common people, who bought scarcely any other books. I therefore fill'd all the little spaces that occurred between the remarkable days in the calendar with proverbial sentences, chiefly such as inculcated industry and frugality, as the means of procuring wealth, and thereby securing virtue, it being more difficult for a man in want to act always honestly as, to use here one of these proverbs, It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright.

These proverbs, which contain the wisdom of many ages and nations, I assembled and formed into a connected discourse, prefix'd to the Almanack of 1757, as the harangue of a wise old man to the people attending an auction. The bringing all these scattered counsels thus into a focus enabled them to make greater impression. The piece, being universally approved, was copied in all the newspapers of the continent, reprinted in Britain on a broadside, to be stuck up in houses; two translations were made of it in French, and great numbers bought by the clergy and gentry to distribute gratis among their

poor parishioners and tenants. In Pennsylvania, as it discouraged useless expense in foreign superfluities, some thought it had its share of influence in producing that growing plenty of money which was observable for several years after its publication.

And just here, before closing, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that previous to his success in publishing the sayings of Poor Richard, this sturdy American, who attained so great a celebrity as to win the attention of the nations, was as modestly human as the rest of us, as indicated in a humorous prologue to his almanac, published along with the first issue in 1733:

The plain truth of the matter is—

He wrote—

I am excessive poor, and my wife, good woman, is, I tell her, excessive proud; she can not bear, she says, to sit spinning in her shift of tow while I do nothing but gaze at the stars, and has threatened more than once to burn all my books and rattling traps (as she calls my instruments) if I do not make some profitable use of them for my family. The printer has offered me some considerable share of the profits, and I have thus begun to comply with my dame's desire.

So the lady of the house was as much in evidence then as she is now, and in the matter of fashions was impelled by motives of style and taste somewhat similar in degree to those that prevail to-day, and the great Franklin, diplomat and philosopher that he was, was generous enough to admit, like any other good husband who wished to keep up with the times, that he actually "needed the money." [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to use any more time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill H. R. 3954, with amendments.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

#### DUPLICATE CHECKS OR WARRANTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3636) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as reenacted and amended by act of February 23, 1909.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3646 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3646. That whenever any original check is lost, stolen, or destroyed disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized, within three years from the date of such check, to issue a duplicate check under such regulations in regard to its issue and payment, and upon the execution of such bond, with sureties, to indemnify the United States, and proof of loss of original check, as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That whenever any original check or warrant of the Post Office Department has been lost, stolen, or destroyed the Postmaster General may authorize the issuance of a duplicate thereof, at any time within three years from the date of such original check or warrant, upon the execution by the owner thereof of such bond of indemnity as the Postmaster General may prescribe: *Provided further*, That when such original check or warrant does not exceed in amount the sum of \$50 and the payee or owner is, at the date of the application, an officer or employee in the service of the Post Office Department, whether by contract, designation, or appointment, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a duplicate check or warrant upon such an affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made before any postmaster by the payee or owner of an original check or warrant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is this bill intended to apply to some particular persons, or is it a bill that applies to conditions generally? It has reference to a good many cases, has it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this bill is a matter of general legislation. In order to explain the general purposes of it, I will say that the people who at the present time I have chiefly in mind are pensioners. In case a pension voucher is lost, either with or without the fault of the pensioner, the Treasury Department can not, without such an authority as this, if the amount is over \$50, issue a duplicate within six months. At the present time with these old men six months is a long period. Hence I introduced the bill in order to reach that class. When it was submitted to the Pension Office it was approved, and when submitted to the Treasury Department they suggested a different draft of the bill, in which the Treasury Department is given authority to prescribe regulations such as it deems best, covering all the vouchers of the Treasury Department; and that is the bill that is here pending. It has the approval of that department as well as of the Pension Office. It passed this House in the last Congress, but in the crush of business in the Senate at the close of the session it did not receive action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 19, on page 2, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized and directed, in the settlement of pensions, to make a monthly payment to all persons borne upon the rolls who can furnish satisfactory proof that they are without an income exceeding \$500 over and above the pension now paid to them."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I make a point of order on that. I do not think it is germane to the bill pending.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO. AND ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at a place known as Browns Ferry, about 4 miles west of Holcomb, Dunklin County, State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "at," near the end of the line, insert the words "or near."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across St. Francis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the township line between townships 22 and 23, range 8 east, in Dunklin and Butler Counties, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

#### SALARIES IN THE PATENT OFFICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 900) amending sections 476, 477, and 440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, pending a statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 476 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. There shall be in the Patent Office a Commissioner of Patents, one first assistant commissioner, one assistant commissioner, and five examiners in chief, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first assistant commissioner and the assistant commissioner shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of commissioner as may be assigned to them, respec-



tively, from time to time by the Commissioner of Patents. All other officers, clerks, and employees authorized by law for the office shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior upon the nomination of the Commissioner of Patents, in accordance with existing law."

Sec. 2. That section 477 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 477. The salaries of the officers mentioned in the preceding section shall be as follows:

- "The Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000 a year.
- "The First Assistant Commissioners of Patents, \$4,500 a year.
- "The Assistant Commissioner of Patents, \$3,500 a year.
- "Five examiners in chief, \$3,500 a year each."

Sec. 3. That so much of section 440 of the Revised Statutes as follows the words "In the Patent Office," and refers to said office only, be amended to read as follows:

"One chief clerk, who shall be qualified to act as a principal examiner.

- "One librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner.
- "Five law examiners.
- "One examiner of classification.
- "One examiner of interferences.
- "One examiner of trade-marks and designs.
- "One first assistant examiner of trade-marks and designs.
- "Six assistant examiners of trade-marks and designs.
- "Forty-three principal examiners.
- "Eighty-six first assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six second assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six third assistant examiners.
- "Eighty-six fourth assistant examiners; and such other examiners and assistant examiners in the various grades as the Congress shall from time to time provide for."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that this bill should be passed by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. MANN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that this bill was passed in the last House, I think, by unanimous consent, after it had been amended? I think it was amended somewhat to conform to the views of the gentleman from New York. I am not interested in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MORRISON] to have the bill passed over, so that it can come up on the next unanimous-consent day. My purpose in doing so is this: The preparation of the legislative bill has just commenced. The gentleman in charge of the bill wanted to have an opportunity to go into this question with the Commissioner of Patents. The bill involves providing additional assistants in the Patent Office. After the examination it may be that the gentlemen may get together.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better ask to have it passed over. This bill was agreed upon by everybody in the last Congress and passed both Houses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but bills that pass by unanimous consent do not always have very much substantial argument from that fact in their favor.

Mr. MANN. This was not passed the first time it came up by unanimous consent, by a long shot.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it should be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MORRISON. I have no objection to its being passed over temporarily, provided that it can be called up later during the day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. I object to its being brought up to-day. Let it go over and reserve its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG FORK OF THE BIG SANDY RIVER, KY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 306) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, Ky., at or near Warfield, Ky.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to William H. Preece, of Inez, Ky., and his successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Warfield, Ky., in the County of Martin, in the State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. This bill seems to be a purely private bill, and I object to it for the same reason that I objected to the others.

The SPEAKER. It is a bridge bill.

Mr. LINDBERGH. It is a private bill, and I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1773, a bill of like import to the one just read, and substitute it for the House bill, and amend the Senate bill by inserting the words "Warfield, Kentucky, and" in line 9, page 1, after the word "near,"

and that the title be amended accordingly. I move that we pass the Senate bill as amended and that the House bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] moves to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1773, and pass the same with an amendment, which the Clerk will read into it. The Clerk will read the entire bill, with the amendment in.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-nine Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the vote on this call of the House include a vote on my motion?

The SPEAKER. No; this is simply a roll call.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not quite understand whether we had gone far enough to include a vote on my motion in this call or not.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Dyer	Igoe	Paige, Mass.
Allen	Fairchild	Jones	Parker, N. Y.
Bacharach	Farley	Keister	Patten
Barchfeld	Fields	Kent	Platt
Beales	Finley	Key, Ohio	Porter
Bennet	Flynn	Kiess, Pa.	Pratt
Brown, W. Va.	Focht	Kitchin	Rauch
Bruckner	Frear	Kreider	Reilly
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	Lafean	Riordan
Caldwell	Gallivan	Lieb	Rowland
Carew	Gardner	Linthicum	Sabath
Casey	Garland	Loft	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Glass	Longworth	Scully
Chipherfield	Graham	Loud	Sells
Coady	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Siegel
Cullop	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Slomp
Dale, N. Y.	Gregg	Maher	Snell
Darrow	Guernsey	Mays	Snyder
Davenport	Hamill	Meeker	Sparkman
Dempsey	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Pa.	Stout
Denison	Haskell	Mondell	Summers
Dies	Haugen	Mooney	Tague
Dill	Hill	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Doelling	Hilliard	Moss, W. Va.	Vare
Doremus	Holland	Mott	Ward
Drukner	Howell	Mudd	Whaley
Dunn	Hulbert	Nolan	Winslow
Dupré	Hutchinson	Olney	Wise

The SPEAKER. On this call 319 Members—a quorum—have answered to their names.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors, a quorum being present. The Clerk will report the bill and read into it the amendments.

The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That W. H. Preece and associates (or the Interstate Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of Kentucky), their (or its) successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va., in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters."

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] demands a second, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] has 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual form of bill granting authority for the construction of a bridge across an interstate stream. Gentlemen of the House understand, I take

it, all about the proposition, so that it is not necessary for me to debate it, and I shall not occupy the time to which I am entitled under the rules unless some one else desires to be heard or to interrogate me regarding it. My bill, which has been unanimously reported by the committee and is now on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, was introduced for the purpose of getting authority for some constituents of mine, who are gentlemen of high standing and entirely responsible, to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. The Senate bill is of slightly different phraseology but its purpose is the same, and in order to expedite the matter I have made the motion to substitute the Senate bill for mine. There is a great deal of development going on along the Tug River, and the point at which it is desired to construct this bridge is becoming quite an important commercial community. The river there is not fordable during a large part of the year, so that a bridge is badly needed. The Senate bill does not describe the location of what I regard as the more important end of the proposed bridge—the Kentucky end—which is to be at or near Warfield, Ky., and the amendment which I have offered is to accomplish that.

I have no desire to take the time of the House myself, but I desire to assure Members that it is a meritorious bill in every respect and I hope it will pass. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. I have yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota, but I will yield later to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What does the gentleman mean by this language?

At a point suitable to the interest of navigation.

Is this bridge in aid of navigation?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; that is the language that is usually put in such bills. It means that the bridge must be constructed subject to the regulations of the War Department, the Tug River being a navigable stream.

Mr. LINDBERGH. What is the bridge to be used for?

Mr. LANGLEY. A highway bridge for ordinary traffic.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Is it to be a toll bridge?

Mr. LANGLEY. I assume that it will be a toll bridge, although I have not been specifically advised as to that. A private corporation is being organized to build it, and, of course, it must be their purpose to make it a toll bridge, unless the local county authorities should decide to purchase it and make it a free bridge, which is sometimes done. However, I know nothing personally about that phase of the matter. I simply know that a bridge is needed there, and I am trying to help pave the way for it.

Mr. LINDBERGH. That is all I wish to ask the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether there is any opposition to this bill in the locality?

Mr. LANGLEY. Oh, none whatever that I have heard of. The bill has been pending for nearly a month and a half. I introduced it the first day of the session, and I have not been advised of the slightest opposition.

I will say further to the gentleman, repeating myself somewhat, that the junior Senator from Kentucky introduced the bill in the Senate and it has passed that body. I introduced a similar bill in the House, which has been unanimously reported by the House committee and is on the calendar. In order to expedite the matter I am asking that the Senate bill be passed and that my bill be laid on the table. That is all the explanation I desire to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules, taking this bill from the Speaker's table, and passing it with the amendments which have been read into it.

The question being taken and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does that action include amending the title, as suggested by me?

The SPEAKER. The amendment to the title was included in the title as read.

#### RURAL POST ROADS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I had that bill put on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent some days ago, but since

that time a different arrangement has been made, and I will ask that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to pass the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That it be stricken off this calendar.

Mr. MANN. I object. That will strike it off the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and that takes it off the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

#### FISH HATCHERY IN OKLAHOMA.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 403) granting to the State of Oklahoma permission to occupy a certain portion of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., and to maintain and operate thereon a fish hatchery.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the State of Oklahoma is hereby granted permission to enter upon and occupy, for the purpose of operating and maintaining thereon a fish hatchery for the propagation of fish for public distribution to the people of said State, and in pursuance thereof to construct ponds, drain the land, plant grass, shrubbery and trees, and otherwise improve and beautify the area to be occupied, the following-described tract of land within the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Okla., viz.: All that portion of said reservation lying and being within the boundary lines described as beginning at the northeast corner of section 19 in township 3 north, range 12 west, Indian meridian, and extending thence west along the section line a distance of 1,820 feet to a point in the center of Medicine Bluff Creek; thence in a southeasterly direction, following the center line of Medicine Bluff Creek, to a point 200 feet west of the east line and 1,700 feet south of the north line of said section 19; thence 200 feet east of the section line between said section 19 and section 20; thence north on the section line between said sections 19 and 20 a distance of 1,700 feet to the point of beginning, said tract containing an area of 39.5 acres more or less: *Provided*, That the occupation and use of the said land for the aforesaid purpose shall in no manner affect the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to said lands; nor the Government's rights of passage over and across the lands so occupied: *Provided further*, That the United States shall not be liable for any damages whatsoever that may at any time occur to the improvements of the State of Oklahoma on said lands: *And provided further*, That the exercise of the rights hereby granted and the execution of any work on said lands hereby authorized shall be in accordance with such plans and specifications as may be approved by the Secretary of War and subject to such further stipulations and conditions as he may prescribe.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present consideration of this bill, though it is not on the call for to-day. I think it ought to be understood that hereafter the rule in reference to three days on the calendar will, in the main, be enforced.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I hope the gentleman will not object to this.

Mr. MANN. I say I shall not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "prescribe," insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to revoke the permission herein granted, if in his judgment it is necessary for the use of such military reservation by the War Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have the gentleman make a brief statement of the bill, so that Members of the House may know what it provides.

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. That instead of asking the Government of the United States to maintain a fish hatchery in Oklahoma, as other States have asked the Government to maintain hatcheries within their boundaries, what this bill does is to grant permission to the State of Oklahoma to maintain a hatchery at State expense; an example which other States might well follow.

For several years my district has insisted on my getting a fish hatchery from the Government, but I have never been able to do so. Last year the State appropriated \$25,000 and built a fish hatchery, and now they want a little corner of this 56,000-acre military reservation to put a few ponds on, and we ask a revocable permit from the Government to establish on that little corner of this reserve, 7 or 8 miles away, these little ponds.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I am in harmony with the gentleman's bill, but Oklahoma is not the only State that seeks this privilege.



In fact, many States have already exercised it, and I want to say that Illinois does more work in the line of fish hatching for the streams of Illinois than does the Federal Government.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. It affords me some gratification, because I was afraid I was alone in failing to secure a Federal appropriation for that purpose.

The War Department drew this bill, and recommends that the bill pass. It only seeks to occupy a remote corner of this large reservation. It is a revocable permit, so that the Government can retake it at any time it sees fit.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What committee reported the bill?

Mr. FERRIS. The Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say that I have had a bill before Congress for some time for a fish hatchery in Texas, but I have not yet been able to secure it. We have only one fish hatchery in the State of Texas, and that is 500 miles from where I live. I hope that we shall soon get a report on that bill.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman a military reservation in his district?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS TUG FORK, BIG SANDY RIVER.

The SPEAKER. The bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, and so forth, was a Senate bill. The bill H. R. 306, of the same tenor, without objection, will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent will be passed, as it has not been on the calendar the requisite three days. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for one hour under a special order.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 11 years I have been a Member of this House and for a goodly portion of that time I have been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I have served one term as the chairman of that committee and have just entered upon my second term as chairman of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, believing that my experience upon the committee mentioned justifies me, I desire to submit a few remarks to the House and the country on the public-building operations of the United States. It seems to me that the many articles which have appeared in the public press of the country during the past three or four years condemning the committee and holding up the Congress itself to public scorn and ridicule for alleged indulgence in "pork-barrel" legislation demand from some one a plain, simple statement of the real facts, if nothing more.

The storm of ridicule and abuse of the committee and of Congress for what has been designated "pork-barrel" legislation was brought into being by certain sensational metropolitan newspapers and saffron-colored magazines and has been so assiduously nurtured by the same agencies that the general public has begun to believe that the chief occupation of the average Member of Congress is the plundering of the Public Treasury for the sole benefit of his particular district. In fact, it has been made to appear that public-building bills have been framed with no regard whatever to the needs of the public service, without reference to the public revenues, with entire disregard of all economic administration, and have been constructed solely upon the idea of giving to every Member of Congress and Senator a slice of the pie.

If these things are true, if Members of Congress are actuated in their legislative conduct by no higher motive than to grab from the Public Treasury all they can get for their own districts, regardless of the merits of the particular proposition, then they are unworthy to be here and should be mercilessly driven by an indignant people from the high places which they dishonor. But, Mr. Speaker, my 11 years of service in this House, my knowledge of its membership during all those years, my close association with the rank and file of this great body, and my fixed, immovable confidence in the integrity of the American House of Representatives all give the lie to these villainous insinuations. [Applause.]

During my humble service here I have seen many men come and go. Some have voluntarily retired from the service, either

to private life or to enter upon the duties of some other station; some have gone down in defeat while seeking reelection; and some, answering the last call, "have crossed over the river and now rest under the shade of the trees." Looking back over the Congresses in which I have been permitted to serve, I can truthfully proclaim that nowhere upon the earth can a more upright, honorable, and patriotic body of men be found than is the American House of Representatives. [Applause.] We may and do differ as to the means of reaching the end, but I do believe that in the heart of every Member upon this floor, and uppermost in that heart, is a sincere and honest desire to reach that end which will best conduce to the honor and glory of the United States. We who are native born love the States from which we hail; those of us who were born on foreign shores love the fatherland; but over and above all we love this glorious Republic, an indissoluble Union of indestructible States, over which floats Old Glory, proud emblem of liberty now and forevermore. [Applause.]

Men representing a Government like this, in a country like this, can not be guilty of the petty pilfering laid at our door by these sensational yellow publications, and this I intend to demonstrate in words and figures so plain that "a wayfaring man, though a fool he be, need not err therein." In the first place, Mr. Speaker, let me say that no politics has ever entered into the deliberations of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It has been a strictly nonpartisan committee, both under Republican and Democratic control. The question of a Member's party affiliation has never been considered in passing on a bill; the merit of the proposition itself was the only thing in each case to which the committee gave thought. No one has ever attempted to make of this a partisan committee, and therefore I was pained a few months ago when a distinguished Republican of the State of Massachusetts, well known to all of us, in an attack on the present Democratic administration, made the astounding statement that if the Democrats would quit squandering so much money on magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South that there would be plenty of money for the legitimate purposes of the Government. I shall not retort by saying that Republican Congresses "squandered" money in public buildings—on the contrary, I expect to show that no Congress, Republican or Democratic, has "squandered" money on public buildings—but I will remind this distinguished gentleman of the fact that the Democrats have not yet passed an omnibus public-building bill, and therefore could not have "squandered" any money on "magnificent public buildings in small towns in the South." The last omnibus public-building bill passed by Congress was approved by President Taft on March 4, 1913, and at that time we had a Republican Senate and a Democratic House. We have had no general public-building bill since the Democrats have been in control of Congress and the Presidency, and, therefore, if there has been any squandering of the public funds on account of public-building legislation it can not be charged to the Democratic Party.

But let us see what the facts are. I intend to appeal from the reckless, sensational statements made by the yellow press, and gleefully repeated by a few alleged statesmen industriously trying to hold onto their jobs by posing as watchdogs of the Treasury in their attacks on public improvements, congressional mileage, a superfluity of janitors, and other like weighty questions of statecraft, to the actual record. [Laughter and applause.]

Congress has been viciously assailed for wasteful extravagance in the matter of the provision for and the construction of public buildings throughout the country. The bills coming from this committee have been referred to as "pork-barrel" bills, and the public has been deceived into believing that in the construction of these general bills it has simply been a matter of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you," without any regard to the merits of the proposition or the needs of the public service whatsoever. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I deny that there has been any appreciable waste of the public money in public-building construction; and, in the second place, I assert without the slightest fear of successful contradiction that if there has been any waste of public money in Federal-building construction, the responsibility therefor can not be laid at the door of Congress. I shall address myself to the latter proposition first, and will recur to the former later on in my remarks. In order to convince the House and the country that Congress is not responsible for any waste of public funds in Federal-building construction, I have only to refer to the law itself. Let it be understood that Congress does not construct public buildings. All we can do is to authorize their construction and furnish the means therefor. Some other governmental agency must attend to the actual construction of the buildings, and Congress, by solemn enactment, has charged the Treasury Department with this duty. In the very nature of things it is utterly impossible

for Congress to determine to the dollar what a public building for each and every city and town in the United States should cost, and therefore a measure of discretion had to be lodged in the executive department charged with their construction.

This being the case, Congress in every item of every general public-building bill has left the cost in the discretion of the Treasury Department. We have never enacted that a specific sum of money should be expended in the construction of a Government building at a particular place, but in each and every case we have fixed the maximum of cost beyond which the Treasury Department could not go. For instance, where we provided for a building at a given place with an authorization of \$100,000 we have always expressly fixed that amount as the "limit of cost," and if in such case the department, in its discretion, felt that a \$50,000 building would answer the purpose, there has never been anything to hinder the construction of a cheaper building. If, therefore, magnificent, monumental buildings have been constructed in one-horse, crossroads towns, where the business of the Government did not demand it, and thereby the money of the people has been needlessly wasted, the fault lies at the door of the Treasury Department and is not chargeable to us. "Thou can'st not shake thy gory head at us and say, Thou did'st it."

The last public-building bill passed by Congress was approved March 4, 1913, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican President and Senate. The next preceding omnibus public-building bill was approved June 25, 1910, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. The next preceding general omnibus public-building bill was approved on May 30, 1908, at which time the House, Senate, and President were all Republican. These three bills carried an aggregate authorization in round numbers of some \$104,000,000, or an average of about \$13,000,000 per annum. From the year 1908, when the first of these omnibus public-building bills was passed, until the present time Congress has passed a number of individual public-building bills; that is to say, bills providing for buildings at particular places. These individual and separate items have amounted in round numbers to some \$13,000,000. Upon a calculation it will be shown that about half of the \$117,000,000 which has been authorized within the last eight years has been authorized to be expended in cities of 25,000 population and over, and the remaining half has been authorized to be expended in cities under 25,000 population. Adding these miscellaneous and separate acts to the three omnibus bills, it will show an authorization of something over \$14,000,000 during the past eight years for public building construction in the United States annually. Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that practically half of all the money authorized by us in the construction of public buildings in this country for the past eight years has gone to cities of 25,000 and over, while the rural communities, which I venture to say, if it could be correctly arrived at, pay into the Treasury much more than half the taxes of the country, have received the other half. If this calculation should be made upon the basis of cities and towns with more than 10,000 population and those with a population under that figure, it would be found, in my judgment, that the cities of more than 10,000 population have received a much larger proportion of these funds than they are entitled to if measured by the amount paid into the Treasury in the way of taxes. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Congress has not dealt unjustly, but, on the other hand, has dealt in a very liberal way with the large cities of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the facts as disclosed by the record, a certain element of the metropolitan press and a certain class of magazines denounce us as "pork-barrel devotees" or "looters of the Treasury" every time we propose to construct a modest public building in a live, progressive, wide-awake town in the rural districts, but when we propose to expend millions for the erection of a marble palace in one of the great cities of the country we are pictured as broad-minded, progressive, and patriotic statesmen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department is about five years behind in its work, and there is not the slightest prospect under existing methods of ever catching up. There are to my mind two reasons why that bureau or branch of the service is so far behind. One reason is the fact that some years ago the then Secretary of the Treasury, without authority of law, issued orders to his subordinates that they were only to construct in one year 25 per cent of the buildings provided for in a general public-building bill but recently passed. Thus it will be seen that with one stroke of the pen and in utter contempt for the will of Congress these buildings were thrown three years behind. I want to say right here that this practice of executive departments issuing orders which practically have the effect of nullifying acts of Congress has grown to such proportions and has been so long and persistently

practiced until the departmental veto has come to be recognized as a legitimate governmental function. Congress is no longer the supreme power in matters of legislation. We, the chosen representatives of the people, selected by popular vote every two years, charged with the duty of writing into the law of the land the will of the sovereign citizenship of the Republic, sit supinely by while mere appointees of the Executive set aside and declare null and void our most solemn enactments. We have tamely submitted to Executive encroachments for so long, we have for so many years given the world such an example of spineless statesmanship, and have with such unconcerned complacency witnessed the Executive appropriation of practically all our prerogatives that even the janitors and messengers of executive departments no longer have respect for the House of Representatives, but instead appear to have a pitying contempt for what they regard as a harmless aggregation of legislative mollycoddles. [Laughter and applause.] How long shall this condition continue? Shall we assert ourselves and again become the vigorous, virile, powerful legislative force which we once were and which it was intended by the fathers of the Republic we should be, or shall we continue to drag out the miserable existence of a dwarfish, misshapen legislative eunuch? [Laughter and applause.] It is up to us, my friends. Which road shall we travel?

Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that from every viewpoint it is desirable to have the Supervising Architect's Office keep abreast of the building operations of the Government. It is neither in the interest of economy nor is it in the interest of good administration to have this or any other branch of the public service five or six years behind in its work. It is better in governmental affairs, as it is better in individual affairs, to drive your work rather than have your work drive you. If it is conceded that it is desirable to catch up and keep up with this important work of the Government, the question How can it be done? naturally arises. Mr. Speaker, I have given a good deal of thought to this question, and I believe that two things are absolutely necessary to be done in order to accomplish the desired result.

First, I believe it is absolutely necessary to reorganize the Office of the Supervising Architect, and place at the head of it a first-class architect who is also a practical, common-sense man of good executive ability. I admit that this combination is hard to find, as most good architects are, as a rule, impractical, visionary dreamers; but there are some who measure up to the requirement, and I have in mind now a gentleman who, in my judgment, will fully meet the requirements in this particular case.

Second, Standardization of buildings wherever possible. This question of standardizing has been much discussed, and most of the architects are opposed to the idea. But, Mr. Speaker, it requires no technical architectural knowledge to know that the plan is entirely feasible. [Applause.] It is not only feasible, but good business judgment demands it as a saver of both time and money in public-building construction.

I am fully aware that both climate and the topography of the country are to be considered, but from the first floor up a standard type can be used no matter what "the lay of the land" or climatic conditions may be. But, Mr. Speaker, my plan of standardization would be to divide the States of the Union into groups with particular reference to climate and topography, and then divide the cities and towns of each group into classes. For instance, I would form one group of the New England States, which for my present purposes I shall call "Group A." I would then take all the towns or cities in group A where the annual postal receipts were from ten to twenty-five thousand dollars and I would designate this as "class 1." I would then have the Supervising Architect draft plans and specifications for a post-office building for a town in class 1 of group A, and these plans and specifications would answer for every town of this class and group. It is absolutely nonsensical to tell me that a post-office building suitable for a certain-sized town in New Hampshire would not be equally suitable for the same-sized town in Rhode Island, or that a post-office building for a certain-sized town in Mississippi would not be equally suitable for a town of like size in Louisiana. A plan of this kind would save to the Government annually a large sum in the drafting of new plans, to say nothing of the immense saving in the matter of time.

In addition to the saving in the drafting of plans and time standardization would result in a tremendous saving in the cost of construction, and would also result in the erection of a class of buildings much better suited to the purposes of the Government from the standpoint of utility than those we are now getting. Of course in advocating standardization I am



speaking with particular reference to those buildings which are to be used solely for post-office purposes.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is the position of Supervising Architect of the Treasury still under the civil service?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but it is vacant now.

Mr. KAHN. Before anybody could be appointed he would have to pass the civil-service examination and be near the top of the eligible list, would he not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Under the present law; yes.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that the post-office building of the future should be essentially a workshop. It should be constructed with a view to utility and comfort rather than with a view to outside architectural beauty. The truth of the whole business is that the waste and extravagance of the past is chargeable directly to the fact that the esthetic dreamers who have been in the Supervising Architect's Office have sacrificed the utility of the building and the comfort of the workers therein to the gimeracks and curly cues of architecture. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that with a common-sense system of standardization and a competent, level-headed architect with executive ability in charge of the Supervising Architect's Office we can effect a saving of at least 40 per cent in the building operations of the Government, have more and better buildings, and catch up with the work in less than three years.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we should not have an omnibus public-building bill at this session of Congress, and I have heard but two reasons given in support of that contention. I desire to say right here that so far as I am personally concerned it makes very little difference to me whether we have a bill or not. I have only one town in my district unprovided for which, under the rule, is entitled to a public building. That town is already provided with a site, and if we have a general bill I shall in all human probability simply ask for a building on the site already secured. It seems to me that under these conditions I should be acquitted of any selfish motive in what I am about to say.

The objections to the passage of an omnibus public-building bill are:

First. That the Supervising Architect is so far behind in his work that it is unnecessary and useless at this time to authorize any further construction.

Mr. Speaker, this is no excuse at all. We can reorganize that office and soon have its work abreast of the authorizations. There is no question of this; and, second, that we are short of funds and can not afford it just now. We can not afford it, we are told, because we will need all the money we can raise for "preparedness." Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of reasonable "preparedness," but if "preparedness" means stoppage of all progress, if it means that all the works of internal improvement must cease, then I am against "preparedness" "tooth and nail," "forever and a day." In this question of "preparedness" a great and unexpected emergency confronts the country. The expense incident to it ought not to be paid out of the current revenues of the Government. It is an unexpected and extraordinary expense to be incurred more for the protection of the future than for the safety of the present, and therefore the logical and proper way to meet it is by an issue of bonds, using the current revenues for the ordinary expenses of the Government, including river and harbor improvements and the construction, enlargement, and repair of public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that some of our friends who are so extremely anxious to meet the desire of the people for an economic administration of public affairs have entirely forgotten the meaning of economy. One of the great reasons, in my humble judgment, which moved the people to turn the Republicans out and put us in in 1912 was the desire of the people for greater economy in public affairs. But the people did not mean by that verdict that they wanted all river and harbor improvement and public-building construction to cease; they simply wanted us to give them the same things which they had been getting for less money than our Republican friends had been giving it to them for. A cessation of progress is not economy; it is simply stagnation and dry-rot. Any man can save money by cutting off one meal a day; but that is not economy—it is pure cussedness and nigardliness. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, a great hue and cry has been raised in some of the metropolitan newspapers and some of the magazines of the country over the construction of public buildings in some of the smaller cities and towns, particularly in the West and South. These publications have had so much to say about "pork," "spoils," "looting the Treasury," and so forth, that all public-building legislation has been brought into ill repute in the

minds of a great many good people. I desire for a short time to discuss this feature of the public-building activities of the Government and answer, if I may be able, the indictment which has been drawn and filed against the manner in which the work has been carried on. Let me assert in the beginning that it is beneath the dignity of this great Republic to occupy the position of a tenant for quarters in which to conduct the public business. Mr. Speaker, when this great Republic was born among the nations of the earth it was never once thought by the great men who established it that government among men was to be a money-making institution. The patriots of those days expected, and rightly expected, that the people who were to inhabit this God-favored land would be willing to pay for Government protection of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They never dreamed that in the years to come a class of alleged statesmen would be found upon this floor seriously debating the question as to whether a certain proposed legislative enactment would be remunerative to the Government or not; they never supposed that men deemed worthy to represent 200,000 free-born American citizens in this great body would be sent here to waste hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money annually in a demagogic *opéra bouffe* effort to cut down the mileage of Members; they did not believe that the American public would ever reach that stage of avarice and venality where their only concern about proposed legislation was whether or not it would pay. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are intelligent, broad minded, and patriotic. They want the best, and they are willing to pay for it. It has been suggested, and in some quarters it is strongly insisted, that a public building should not be erected at any place where the rent is less than the interest on the cost of a building plus the upkeep charges. I take issue with this contention, and shall endeavor briefly to give some of the reasons which impel me to take this position. I freely concede that this question of financial profit or loss should be considered, but I do most emphatically deny that this should be the controlling factor. In determining whether the Government should construct and occupy its own building in a given town quite a number of matters should be taken into consideration.

First. The present and prospective importance of the town, with particular reference to the volume of public business transacted there, and the probability of its increase in the near future. We now have a statute in which Congress has declared that in those places where there is no Federal activity other than the post office no site can be purchased where the postal receipts do not amount to at least \$7,000 and no building can be authorized where the postal receipts do not amount to at least \$10,000 annually. This rule was written into the law of the land in the Sixty-second Congress after conference between the two Houses and mature deliberation. So that your committee, in determining whether a public building should be constructed at a given place, not only investigates the postal receipts for the past year, but looks into the receipts for several years past, examines into the growth in population, business, and so forth, in order to determine as to the stability of the town and the likelihood of the continuance of its growth.

Second. The amount of rent being paid by the Government, the character of building occupied, and its distance from the railroad station or stations or steamboat wharves.

Sometimes we find that the rent is merely nominal, with the object of having the post office located in a certain section of the town. Sometimes we find that while the Government is paying a very small rental the office is located in a veritable fire trap, which is not only dangerous but a positive disgrace to a great Government like ours. Very frequently we find that the post office is located more than 80 rods from the depot or wharf, which entails on the Government the additional cost of carrying the mails from the depot or wharf to the post office and from the post office to the depot or wharf.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper for me to state here that in all towns or cities where the post office is located within 80 rods of the depot or wharf to which mail is brought the railroad or steamboat company, as the case may be, is compelled under the law to deliver that mail at the post office, and I have in mind now one city in the United States where the Government is under contract to pay, and is paying, \$200,000 per annum for the hauling of the mail to and fro between the post office and the railway stations. I want to say in this connection that in every case of a new building your committee is, and has been for some years past, trying to locate it within this 80-rod limit.

Third. Whether any Federal activities other than the post office are located at that particular place. We do this because sometimes we find, particularly in the South and West, small towns whose postal receipts do not quite reach the required

amount, but where, in addition to the post office, there is a Federal court, land office, or some other Federal activity which must be housed.

Fourth. The location of the town. That is to say, whether it is a railroad or mining center or the center of a vast territory, growing rapidly and with an unquestionable future.

These are some of the principal matters, Mr. Speaker, into which your committee makes inquiry in determining the location of a public building for the use of the Government.

I hold no brief for the committee in what I am about to say, but speaking for myself alone, and as an individual member of this great body, I want to say that there are some other considerations which move me and operate upon my mind when giving attention to the matter of constructing Federal buildings in the smaller cities and towns, and particularly those of the interior. The great rural population of this country constitutes the very "bone and sinew" of the land—the backbone of the Republic. If I had the time, I believe I could show that they pay the great bulk of the taxes necessary to support the Government in times of peace, and God knows that in times of war the American country boy follows Old Glory where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He sees very little of the blessings of government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, and if I had the power I would erect for every presidential post office throughout the broad domain of the Republic a Government building representative of the sovereignty and the glory of this great country. From Maine to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, in every town of sufficient importance to have the President name the postmaster, I would erect a suitable but not extravagant building, and from its apex the Stars and Stripes, proud emblem of the glory of the Republic, should forever wave an inspiration to the youth of the land. Suppose here and there it should be a little more expensive in dollars and cents to own a building than it is to rent. Is it worth nothing to inspire patriotism and love of country in the hearts and minds of the youth of the country? No youth or citizen ever looked upon a Federal building in which the business of his country was being conducted but that he became a better American. Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well when I gazed for the first time upon this imposing building. It was just about 39 years ago, when I was a boy, not quite 17 years of age, and came to Washington for the first time. I had started from my home down in Georgia for the great Northwest, there to carve out my fortune. Although it was out of my way, I decided to come by Washington and see the wonderful city of which I had heard so much. I looked upon it as the seat of government of a foreign people, and somehow when I crossed the Potomac felt that I was on hostile soil. But, Mr. Speaker, when I came up Pennsylvania Avenue, and standing at the foot of the hill looking up at this magnificent structure, surmounting the dome of which stood a figure of the Goddess of Liberty; when I recalled the seven-years' struggle of the revolutionary patriots; the War of 1812; and the triumphant march of American soldiery across the sands of Mexico into the "Halls of the Montezumas," and remembered that the same blood which coursed through my veins had been shed in each of those three conflicts, I said, Thank God, this is my country, and Old Glory is my flag. [Applause.]

Breathes there a man with soul so dead  
Who never to himself has said  
This is my own, my native land?

[Applause.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GARLAND, for three days, on account of death in his family.

#### STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 407, with Mr. Cox in the Chair.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The committee did not go into a long discussion of the merits of this bill, with the idea in view of taking it up under the five-minute rule so that it may be disposed of as expeditiously as possible under all the existing circumstances. I just want to say a word in regard to the general features of the bill. It is well known that we have had for many years our 160-acre home-

stead law and that it has been effective in the West, and permitted the valuable tracts of land to be taken up, so that a man could go upon a tract with his family and get a comfortable living for himself and those dependent upon him. Following that we had the 320-acre homestead law, which applied to a different character of land than that provided in the 640-acre homestead. That applied to land that was nontimbered, land that was not then known to be subject to irrigation. At the same time we reserved the minerals to the Government in the 320-acre homestead and do the same in this bill. That law has worked well, has permitted many hundreds of thousands of acres of the public land of the West to be filed upon, and it gave homes to our citizens, to the end that they have been able to maintain their families successfully and assist in building up the community in which the land is located and in the construction of schools and towns and good roads. Before passing this it must be recognized, and I am sure that many of the Members have forgotten it, that we had in force for many years what was known as the timber-culture law, which permitted a man to obtain 160 acres adjoining his homestead by planting trees upon it, to be added to the rest of his home, that he might use it for agricultural as well as grazing purposes.

In conjunction with the homestead of 160 acres we had during many years what was known as the preemption law, which permitted a man to file upon 160 acres and, living upon that land for six months and paying \$1.25 an acre for it, to obtain title to the land. It ought to be called to the attention of the committee, and I think I can safely say this, that with the exception of those who have gone there since the repeal of the preemption law, over half of the men in the West obtained a preemption claim and a homestead claim, which gave them 320 acres for their home. A number got the benefit of the timber-culture law. While few literally complied with the terms of it, it was afterwards amended to the extent that if they proved they cultivated a certain percentage of it they were permitted to make final proof. So that we find they were permitted to acquire a considerable quantity of land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, we now find large tracts of land provided for in the bill which are chiefly valuable for grazing and for the purposes of raising forage crops, and which do not contain much of the timber and are not susceptible to irrigation from any known source, and we believe that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

It is a fact that with a great deal of this land, of which there are millions of acres, that to plow it and destroy the native sod to a great extent ruins the value of the land for the farmer; and the purpose of the department, and that has been acted upon by the committee, is to give a man a sufficient quantity of land remaining which will permit him to go upon the land and live without cultivation, unless he can cultivate a small tract of 10 acres or 5 acres for the purpose of raising garden stuff and other things close at home, where he has a well or a spring, in order that he might raise stock, a few cattle, a few horses, and in some instances, in connection with cattle and horses, a few sheep. He will thereby become a permanent settler. He will add to the beef supply of the country, because it has been demonstrated by statistics which were thoroughly presented to the committee that in the settled communities and in the western public-land States there has been a large increase in cattle, in horses, and in many instances in sheep as the community settled and as the land became under private ownership, and that a better grade of cattle has been raised, for which the farmer received a better price. It is unquestionable and it is without doubt that the day of the great cattle king, horseman, and sheepman, so far as using the control of the great areas of the public domain is concerned, has passed.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Does the gentleman not think that he is now affording some opportunity to the stock owners, the big stock owners, to gather to themselves a large measure of the public domain by the passage of this act?

Mr. RAKER. No. In answer to that question I believe that the public-land States from the time of the 160-acre tracts to the 320-acre tracts and also the Kinkaid Act, which applied to western Nebraska, of 640 acres, the report will show that practically only 10 per cent—I believe it is less—of these homesteaders, of men living in that country, who own more than 640 acres, or



whose tracts have been disposed of, and from one or two millions the increase in productiveness and value has grown up to millions, and the department shows it is settled by good citizens, who live there, who have built up schools and churches and towns as well as they have in other parts of the United States, and that the large cattlemen have not been able to obtain the tracts that were possible to obtain at one time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much land can a homesteader now own under existing law?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 160 acres as homestead land and 160 acres of timber and stone land or 160 acres of desert land, or 320 acres of desert land. Except from the Kinkaid Act and the enlarged homestead law, a man to-day can only get 320 acres, when years before—I just want to enumerate—you permitted him to get a preemption tract of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a homestead of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a stone and timber claim of 160 acres; you permitted him to get a desert claim of 640 acres, and in some locations you permitted him to get 640 acres of desert claim besides the 640 acres under the general desert-land law. In addition to that, you permitted him to get a timber-culture entry.

Now, notwithstanding all these many entries and the large amount that was involved, and when all the best land had been obtained, we ask now simply that you recognize the homesteading people of the West and that a man may go there and receive a sufficiently large tract of land for him to make a home upon and from which he may support himself and family.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may have five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the settler has acquired 640 acres, is he now at his maximum which he can acquire?

Mr. RAKER. It is 320 acres now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the maximum amount now that he can obtain—640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No; 320 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If he had 320 acres now, under the gentleman's bill can he obtain more?

Mr. RAKER. He can obtain 320 acres more, making 640 acres, provided the 320 acres he acquires is of the same class and character as that designated in this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not we have a bill passed in the last session that provided for a 640-acre tract?

Mr. RAKER. This is the same bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is this the same bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. If a man acquires, under subdivision 2, 640 acres, his right is exhausted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What does this paragraph 9 bestow upon a man who has 640 acres; the right to purchase?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; the right to purchase where he has less than 640 acres.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not where he has 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. No. In other words, if a man has 160 acres, and there is a tract of land adjoining him of this character, he may buy enough of it to make 640 acres. No; he can only buy 320 acres of this kind of land, and add to what he already has.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If this bill passes, a man could not acquire a maximum of more than 640 acres?

Mr. RAKER. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Under existing law and this additional law?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And this pertains only to arid or semiarid lands?

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Under this, is one who takes up 640 acres required to live upon it?

Mr. RAKER. He is; he can not commute it, the same as a 160-acre homestead; but the only thing he does not have to do is he does not have to cultivate it, because much of this land ought not to be cultivated; but he must put in \$1.25 of improvements to the acre.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What kind of improvements?

Mr. RAKER. Fences, houses, wells, barns, and things that are permanent for the purpose of developing and adding to his home.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In building a fence around 640 acres, is that accepted as doing all that is necessary?

Mr. RAKER. If he adds the value of \$1.25 an acre, because that brings it to the very highest state of use and—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. But would not that lead to the very thing the gentleman spoke of first—

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Now, wait a moment—of acquiring this land for the purpose of disposing of it to the very large owners of land there and stock raisers?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And ultimately result in getting it into one big block of great areas of land under this law?

Mr. RAKER. From my observation and experience up to date, and the information which we get that has been presented by the department, and particularly under the Kinkaid 640-acre Act, from actual experience of 30 years I would say no; that these men would take them for homes, for the purpose of using it and occupying it and build up and become part of the community in which the land was situated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would the gentleman in charge of the bill consent to an amendment that improvements to the value of \$1.25 an acre, exclusive of fences, should be required?

Mr. RAKER. Well, I think no; for this reason: Now, gentlemen know that this is for the purpose of a stock-raising homestead. Gentlemen, the use of the land, the value of the land, is the fact that a man by dint of hard work and skimping in the things he needs and his wife needs, so that he may be able to get enough money to put up a good, substantial fence under the State law around this 640 acres, so that he, and he alone, may get the benefit of it and add to the value of his holdings—

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer the question, too.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken] have both raised a question that ought to be raised here and ought to be debated and looked into, and that is, Will the granting of a large unit to anybody result in it getting into the hands of a few people?

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted, if the gentleman will yield—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. I merely wanted to state in connection with that that the State I have the honor to represent in part has perhaps more public lands by a good deal than any State in the Union. In fact, we have one-fifth of the unappropriated public land in the United States, something over 50,000,000 acres. Now, I think there is nothing that the large cattle owner and sheep owner would get from this bill to the detriment of any citizen of this country, and nothing they want to get, for this reason: That they have absolute right now to run their herds over the public domain, and they can get it cheaper than they could by buying somebody's homestead right. I merely state that as a reason. Why should it be to their benefit to buy something when they do not have to pay anything at all now? The cattlemen and sheepmen do not favor this bill.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman. The Department of the Interior had in contemplation the passage of this bill this year because it passed the House last year. I reintroduced it again this year on the first day of the session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was that bill called a bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes?

Mr. FERRIS. The bill is the same as last year. We did not cross a "t" or dot an "i."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The title is the same?

Mr. FERRIS. That is my recollection. I dropped it in the basket just as it passed the House last year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to inquire whether there is any provision in this bill for the granting of these homesteads to anyone under 21 years of age?

Mr. FERRIS. No; there is not. I think there is a separate bill pending, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Taylor], to grant homesteads to boys and girls of 18 years of age or over. That is not dealt with in this bill at all. As to the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken], as I said, the bill passed the House last year, and the Department of the Interior knew it was going to be introduced and pressed

again this year. So they made an investigation by sending men out to western Nebraska to determine what had been done under the only 640-acre law that had ever been passed, the Kinkaid Act. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] is still a Member of the House, and an honored one, and is entitled to great credit for having blazed the way for this 640-acre legislation. He got this legislation as applying to 37 counties in the sand hills of western Nebraska. At that time they could not get anybody to live there except cattlemen and sheepmen. They argued that if we passed a law giving them 640 acres of land, in a few years a few men would own it all and drive the cattle all out of the country. Now, as I have said, the Department of the Interior sent special agents out to investigate that very thing, first to ascertain if they would buy it all up, and if it really worked that way; and, second, if it really did drive the cattle out of the country.

Now, here is what they say on the subject of large holdings:

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres.

Now, that is less than the unit originally granted.

In the 37 counties affected by this law it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders—

These cases, I assume, are where the first entryman started out and sold to a second man who had a little more money and was able to stick a little tighter and remain a little longer, because it is still in the hands of the small owner. They say further:

And only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres.

Now, the Kinkaid Act, passed 11 years ago, in 1904—pretty nearly 12 years ago—and you can see that a very small amount has crept into the hands of big holders, and you can see what a large amount has remained in the original entryman's hands, and you can see there is a family in that community for every 571 acres, which is less than the present size of unit. They say further:

The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Let me go back and show you the figures as to whether or not it actually drives cattle out of the country. I have no doubt the Members of the House feel that because we pass a large unit, that runs the cattlemen out. Not at all. The small farmer has more cattle and produces more cattle on a given area than they do where the range is not protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed further. I will not burn up much more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERRIS. The big objection to this legislation always is that it drives the cattlemen out of business and drives the sheepmen out of business and all that kind of argument. Let me give you the facts. The Kinkaid Act passed in 1904. The value of the cattle in 1904, when the Kinkaid Act was passed, was \$3,176,100. Let us get this, because here is a point the committee ought to know:

In 1914—

That was last summer a year ago, when this investigation was made—

\$4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

Now, listen to the rest of this showing:

In 1904—

That was the year when the Kinkaid Act was passed—  
30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, in raising the unit a little—

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. I want to know from the gentleman if the figures there give an increase in the number of head of cattle? The gentleman gave the value.

Mr. FERRIS. I believe it does. I will see if I can turn to it. I did not report this bill and have not given much attention to it. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] reported the bill. I think it does give the number of head.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is familiar with the public-land laws. I would like to call his attention to section 10 of the bill, which provides—

That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented—

And so forth.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would that cover the Government's interest in oil lands?

Mr. FERRIS. It would. We believe it would cover every kind of mineral. All kinds of minerals are reserved; and, more than that, it does not apply to timberlands or to lands susceptible of irrigation or any land that can get water from any known source. It merely gives the settler who is possessed of any pluck an opportunity to go out and take 640 acres and make a home there. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and I rode over it last summer, and if a man can stick on that land and convert it into a prosperous community, as was done under the Kinkaid Act, I say, "God speed him on."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If any oil should be discovered on these lands later on, the Government's right to that oil would be preserved under this mineral clause, would it?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and further, this act authorizes the re-entry upon these lands to extract oil and coal and anything else in the way of minerals that may be on it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not think it is necessary to specify oil?

Mr. FERRIS. No. That is a mineral. But I have no objection to it being mentioned specifically if it is at all thought necessary. I feel doubly sure, however, it is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been called to my attention that the word "mineral" would not include oil.

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think it is necessary; but if the gentleman thinks there is any conceivable doubt about it we will put it in, because not a single gentleman from the West who has been urging this legislation wants anybody to be allowed to homestead mineral land. This does not apply to a single acre of land in my own State, and therefore I have no selfish interest in it. But these gentlemen who are interested in it do not want to homestead mineral land or ordinary homestead land or oil land.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is a provision here that permits a man who has taken up and homesteaded one of these tracts, and wants to give it up and take up 640 acres under this law, to do that?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In case he does that and takes up 640 acres, is he required to live on it?

Mr. FERRIS. He is; and he is required to comply with every other requirement of this bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I did not understand that it was necessary for him to live on it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me give the gentleman a practical example. Suppose under the existing law the gentleman from Michigan and myself resided in Colorado. Suppose we had made a 320-acre homestead of arid land, or 160 acres, which is as much as we can get, of better land. Suppose the gentleman and myself were just in the act of failing to stay there by reason of the smallness of our holdings. This bill says we can relinquish our holdings and turn them back to the Government and start over anew.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I would call the gentleman's attention to section 9, on page 7. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. FERRIS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I am not presumptuous enough to estimate that my humble vouching for the successful operation of the Nebraska act will add anything to the ex cathedra



report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior in reporting on the provisions of the pending bill, inasmuch as the report gives such a hearty and unqualified indorsement of the Nebraska act, of which I was the author.

Right here, Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Members who have given such generous indorsement of the virtues of the Nebraska act, incidentally complimenting the Nebraska Member, its author. I will at once admit the act to be fully deserving of the indorsement given it by the membership of this House, but I shall not admit myself to be fully entitled to the complimentary expressions bestowed upon me. However, I am very grateful both for justice done the act and the consideration given me by the Members of the House. I wish to again thank the Members who helped to pass the act in this House February, 1904. I wish also to thank, on this floor, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and their able and painstaking assistants, both in the departments here in Washington and in the field service, for the careful, fair, painstaking, and thorough investigation made and report of the operation of the Nebraska act. This official finding, from which later I shall briefly quote, justly closes the question whether the act of April 28, 1904, was in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, it was a burning question in western Nebraska when I was first nominated for the House what was to be done with the public-land question. On the one hand, was it to be a leasing bill whereby the lands would remain public domain and nontaxable in the hands and under control of large ranchmen lessees indefinitely, or, on the other hand, should it be an enlarged homestead act whereby the many would be afforded an opportunity to acquire homes. I did not hesitate to choose the latter alternative, and I introduced a bill for a 640-acre homestead. It was regarded as rather a novelty here, and precedents were demanded. My answer was that we had better make a precedent, and that this case would be an experiment.

Very strong opposition did exist in my district to the bill, and this very naturally by those who had so long enjoyed the benefits of free range for their herds. Had it been deemed likely that the bill would receive favorable consideration by the Congress, I feel confident that opposition would have become organized and determined in an effort to defeat it. But no opposition came up from western Nebraska or other localities in the grazing West to protest to the Congress against the measure, and the bill became law.

Paradoxically as it would now seem in the light of the report of the present able Secretary of the Interior, the then honorable Secretary of the Interior refused the bill his sanction on the ground that the bill was being sought in the interests of the large ranchmen, who were, in fact, generally opposed to it. While the law was applauded by the mass of the people, its enactment evoked for a time strong opposition among large ranchmen both in Nebraska and in other parts of the grazing West to which it was feared its provisions might be extended.

Mr. Chairman, it is very gratifying to me to be warranted in stating the fact that practically all opposition in Nebraska which at first arose to the Nebraska act has gradually turned to hearty approval.

But while the operation of the act continued to gain for it popularity at home, organized influences outside of Nebraska, by newspaper and magazine publications, tried hard to write it down. In fact, it was only a year ago when delegates coming from the far West appeared before the Public Lands Committee of the House and charged that the operation of the Nebraska act had been a failure. But they were seeking the passage of a leasing bill in opposition to a homestead bill like the one now pending.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that uncalled-for assaults made upon the measure by opposition organized in States west of Nebraska at times have caused me some annoyance, but I never deemed them of sufficient importance to require refutation on the floor of this House, but by analogy I found justification as well as consolation in the rule of evidence that the reputation of an individual is legitimately determined by what the people in his own vicinity may think of him, knowing full well that the Nebraska act was constantly being vindicated by the people in the territory included in its provisions.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the change from a 160-acre to a 640-acre unit for a homestead in Nebraska soon wrought a great transformation. For a few years preceding its enactment the population in the territory covered by the act had actually been decreasing, contrary to the ordinary rule in a new and undeveloped country. The effect was to change this order to a rapidly increasing population. Hitherto in the small towns the lumberyards and the hotels had been abandoned. Now these businesses were restored and made prosperous, and all other

branches of business were likewise favorably affected by the change. New paint was applied to the neglected buildings of these partially depopulated towns and a new atmosphere of activity, upgrowth, and prosperity was realized.

In keeping with the increase of population the number of school districts and schoolhouses was increased. The high standard of the Nebraska common school, second to that of no State in the Union, became extended more and more to the newly formed settlements. In passing it is proper to state all that is necessary to be done in Nebraska to secure funds for a good school is to perform the condition precedent of securing a sufficient number of children of school age to patronize it and profit by it, for a large school fund is permanently provided for. This insures the best quality of instruction, generally by young women in the country districts, graduates of high schools, State normal schools, and many of them graduates of our own Nebraska State University or other Nebraska universities, of which we are proud, as well as such educational institutions in other States.

Mr. Chairman, and the Sunday-school missionaries have also contributed bountifully to the general uplift. They have promoted so much for the good of these new communities that I find myself too much limited in time to accord them due credit. Let it suffice to say there has been employed to work with the new population of children a number of men—talented, most enterprising, faithful, energetic, up-to-date, and most efficient Sunday-school missionaries I have every known anywhere. Thus in the area in question creditable school buildings and churches in due proportion to the area partially reflect the rapid progress of the inhabitants. But I should add the pulpits are here filled as ably as anywhere in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, my time being too limited to longer dilate on the favorable change produced by the operation of the act, I shall here read from the report of the honorable Secretary of the Interior, made December 15, 1915, on the pending bill, to the House Committee on the Public Lands, beginning with the last paragraph on page 3 thereof and reading to the commencement of the last paragraph on page 4.

It reads:

Since the last session of Congress the department has been seeking information as to the advisability of the passage of such a law as is now proposed by this bill. Attention has been especially directed to the operation of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat., 547), which authorized the entry of not exceeding 640 acres of land in a considerable area of western Nebraska. The provisions of that act, as applying to that limited area, were in the main designed to meet the same conditions which the present bill proposes to meet as to other areas of the public lands. Eleven years have elapsed since the passage of the law relating to western Nebraska, and the investigations of the department as to the results of that legislation are both important and significant. Prior to the passage of the act of 1904 considerable land in western Nebraska had been entered under other laws, but the marvelous development since the passage of the act of 1904 is so marked that it must in great measure at least be attributed to that law. It has been found that some of the valleys and lower lands which intersperse the larger area have been made to produce through intensive cultivation varied crops of large value, and that the production of live stock has largely increased rather than diminished. The improvements placed by the settlers upon their claims indicate both prosperity and permanency of occupation, as dwellings of stone, cement, or frame construction, plastered and provided with conveniences, have generally supplanted the original sod houses, and the farmer who has not built barns, silos, or other structures for storing crops and protecting live stock is a rare exception. The live stock raised upon the small ranches is of a higher grade than that which was produced by grazing upon the vacant public lands.

It appears from statistics collected, covering 31 counties within the area to which said law is applicable, that the population was 124,508 in 1890, 107,434 in 1900, and 162,217 in 1910, an increase of nearly 50 per cent in population during said 10-year period, during 6 years of which the 640-acre homestead law was in force.

The value of household furniture increased from \$174,779 in 1904 to \$342,312 in 1914, an increase of 95 per cent.

The value of agricultural implements in 1904 was \$139,609; in 1914, \$243,304; increase, 74 per cent.

The value of cattle in 1904 was \$3,176,109; in 1914, \$4,267,055; increase, 34 per cent.

In 1904, 30 counties produced 69,962 bushels of potatoes; in 1914, 2,671,924 bushels; increase, 3,719 per cent.

Number of acres planted to rye in 27 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to oats in 28 counties in 1904, 47,451; in 1914, 91,336; increase, 92 per cent.

Number of acres planted to corn in 28 counties in 1904, 564,554; in 1914, 1,143,916; increase, 102 per cent.

Number of acres planted to wheat in 27 counties in 1904, 122,799; in 1914, 297,900; increase, 142 per cent.

Number of horses in 31 counties in 1892, 107,295; in 1904, 168,556; increase, 57 per cent; in 1914, 282,624; increase, 67 per cent.

Number of hogs in 29 counties in 1904, 171,849; in 1914, 225,480; increase, 31 per cent.

The acreage of improved land in 27 counties increased 68 per cent in 12 years, 1892 to 1904; increased 77 per cent in 10 years, 1904 to 1914. The value of the improved land decreased 18 per cent the first period and increased 143 per cent the second.

The total assessed valuation of all property in 31 counties in 1892 was \$23,468,899.69; in 1904, \$27,480,836.57; increase, 17 per cent; in 1914, \$57,278,766; increase, 108 per cent.

Of the land entered in Nebraska under the section law there is an average of one settler for every 571 acres. In the 37 counties affected by this law, it appears that there are 4,589,870 acres in the hands of

the original entrymen, 6,411,963 acres in the hands of small holders, and only 316,453 acres in the hands of what might be termed large holders; that is, those possessing areas in excess of 2,000 acres. The department is informed that the practically unanimous sentiment of the people in western Nebraska is that the law has been a benefit to them and to the country, causing a large increase in the population, promoting the development of the lands, and advancing generally the public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, there are few unacquainted with the territory covered by the act who can adequately conceive of the splendid picture—which is a reality—which this report presents; it shows plainly that an abundant harvest is being reaped from the operation of the law our Congress was wise enough to pass nearly 12 years ago. Is not 12 years a sufficient test and when successful a sufficient vindication of the merits of a law?

Mr. Chairman, no other public-land law has ever attained greater popularity than the Nebraska act is accorded by the people in the community where the lands lie.

Mr. Chairman, as I told my constituents at the time, the reason for providing for an enlarged homestead instead of for a leasing law was based upon the rule of legislation, "the greatest good to the greatest number," and this has abundantly proven to be the character of the act in this case.

Mr. Chairman, the pending Ferris bill fundamentally is the same as the Nebraska act, and its purpose is the same. And I am confident that if duly enacted into a law its operation will prove beneficent and inure to the great good of the people generally and to the States wherever the act may be applied. I am therefore most heartily in favor of the Ferris bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the gentleman's remarks debate on this paragraph may close.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; there are several gentlemen over here who wish to discuss it.

Mr. MANN. We would like to have 25 minutes on this side.

Mr. FERRIS. Then I think we can get along faster by not asking for any limitation.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he make his request.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MANN. Of which I am to have control of 25 minutes?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of 35 minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. FERRIS. Twenty-five minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in listening to the explanation of the gentleman on the committee who reported this bill as to its effect on the stock-raising industry of the West. If the bill has the effect of increasing the production of live stock in the West, as the gentleman anticipates, it will not only be of great benefit to the public-land States but to the entire country. Everyone familiar with the live-stock industry in this country has noted with alarm that in the last decade the supply of live stock has steadily decreased as the population and consuming power of the American people have increased. The explanation of that is very simple. As the land in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys and in the older sections of our country becomes more thickly settled it becomes increasingly difficult for the farmer to raise the young stock necessary to keep up the supply. If he had an ample supply of stockers and feeders he could employ them profitably on his blue grass, with his corn, and fatten them for the market; but the difficulty has been in raising the supply of stockers and feeders; and frequently it is to be noticed that in the great live-stock markets of Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, and Chicago the stockers and feeders bring a price almost as high as that brought by cattle on the market.

I take it, this land will not be confined to raising stockers and feeders, because in the great alfalfa belt, in which the land is located, a large amount of the cattle—or a fair percentage of them—will be fattened for actual slaughter; but, as I understand, this will provide an increasing area for the raising of young stock, for stockers and feeders, for the more thickly settled portions of the country, and to my mind that is the solution of the American cattle business. We have ample blue grass in the Missouri Valley, ample pasture and water, and ample corn.

If the Department of Agriculture adopts standard grades of corn to be shipped in interstate commerce, there will be a certain amount of corn that must be fed on the farm and that can not be shipped profitably. Therefore the farmer must have some stock to eat the corn and other feed which remains on his farm.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I have not a great deal of time.

Mr. RAKER. In confirmation of what the gentleman has stated I want to read one sentence, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This comes from Montana:

I believe that the enactment of the law providing for 640-acre homesteads will result in the production of a greater number of cattle than were found on those ranges during the most prosperous days of the cattle range.

Mr. BORLAND. I hope that will prove true. In the old days, when I was a boy in the live-stock business, we had an open range covering all the territory of the gentleman from Oklahoma and large parts of other States. To-day most of that range is either in private ownership or in forest reserves or otherwise withdrawn. The live-stock business has suffered in consequence, and we are going to Argentina and elsewhere to find beef for slaughtering in this country. In fact, some of our American packing houses are now located in the South American countries. If this bill does have a tendency to increase the live-stock production of this country, it will be a valuable thing for every section of the country, including the great consuming centers of the East.

In addition to that not only is the cattle industry affected but the sheep industry. In our section of the country sheep are used by the farmers principally to clear up pasture and brushwood and stuff of that kind. It is difficult for our farmers to get sheep; sheep are selling high in Missouri to-day under the blessings of Providence and a Democratic administration. The farmers can not pick up bunches of sheep, as they would like to, for the purpose of clearing up old pastures and clearing up old woodland; but here is another outlet for enterprise and industry for our friends on the public-land States. They can raise sheep for the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys, and every bunch of young sheep would be readily taken up by the farmers in my section. I am glad to support the bill that will not only produce more population for the Western States but will tend to increase the live-stock industry in the whole country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have procured this time simply to ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief extract from an address by Prof. Charles H. Herty, of North Carolina, to the American Chemical Society, of which he is president.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of Prof. Charles H. Herty. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 1, line 4, the word "qualified" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "qualified" and insert in lieu thereof the word "entitled."

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, according to my reading of this section, the language is ambiguous as to whether the present phraseology would not grant to those who have already exercised the privilege of homestead an additional right to take 640 acres under this bill. I have read the section of the Revised Statutes applicable that gives the right to a homestead entry, and certainly there is nothing there that would forbid the person from exercising again the right under this law if he has heretofore exercised it. The word "entitled" clears that ambiguity, and certainly it was not the intention of the committee to grant to those who have already exercised the right an additional homestead.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in sympathy with the purpose of trying to increase the acreage for stock-raising purposes. There is no question but that the supporters of this bill will attain great popularity in those States where these lands are situated. We know the rare popularity and deserved popularity of the gentleman from Nebraska who gave to his people the addi-



tional privilege of locating on some 480 acres. Of course, every farmer in the western country who has already taken a homestead entry of 160 acres will be most thankful for the additional grant of 480 acres. That goes without saying.

But, Mr. Chairman, it can not escape my thought that some of these lands will fall into the hands of large stock raisers because there is no condition of tenure whatever placed upon those who take the additional amount and commute; as soon as he pays the \$1.25 an acre he may, as soon as he gets the patent, sell to some large stock-raising concerns of whom we know so much by reputation, who have preempted the lands in great stock-raising estates in Montana and other Western States.

All through the bill runs the idea that you want to give additional land to the local person. As I view the question of the vacant public lands, I favor their retention for the benefit of those who have not to-day any public land. We all know that there are thousands living in the Middle West who wish to find some little spot where they may have land enough to call home. But this bill I hardly think will result in getting those people to go into the far West. It is said that the available public lands are of poor quality. I must confess that I do not know. And yet I have inquiries from constituents as to lands available to take up a home. If it were not for the fact that I believe that much of this land is suitable for a homestead under the present 320-acre law, I would be more inclined to support this bill very strongly. Every session bills are coming in here conferring additional grants to those who have already entered a homestead, and thereby taking away the land from those who are entitled by right to preempt it—those living in distant parts of the country, who have not availed themselves of that right. With the remaining public land, our policy should be to retain it for the benefit of those without a home, and there are many thousands who wish to locate on the public land, even though the best has already been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—ayes 14, noes 16.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], now that his amendment is defeated, that under the decisions of the Interior Department for the last two or three years, decisions rendered time after time, no one who has made and perfected a homestead entry for any area, even as small as 40 acres, would be allowed to take a homestead under this language.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this is a new law.

Mr. MONDELL. The decisions that have been rendered are under the 320-acre enlarged homestead law containing identical language.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those decisions are not written into this law.

Mr. MONDELL. Unless the department changes its decisions there would be no question about it, and the word the gentleman proposes is one that never has been passed upon, and no one can know what it would be interpreted to mean, whereas the term used is one that has been used in the law for years.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word I did suggest is one with a clear meaning, whereas the language here has not a clear meaning.

Mr. MONDELL. The word "qualified" has been passed upon frequently since we had homestead laws. At one time under the decision of the Interior Department the words "qualified entryman" were held to embrace all otherwise qualified who had not perfected entry to a full 160 acres, but several years ago they were held to include only those who had never perfected an entry.

As to the suggestion of our friend from Wisconsin that we are proposing to open up a lot of land to homestead entries for the benefit of those in the States where the lands lie rather than for those who may come from other States, it is true that there are some sections of this bill which would give benefits to those already on the ground, but the general provisions of the bill will be utilized in nine cases out of ten by people who come from other States rather than the States in which the lands are located. Under the enlarged-homestead bill which we passed several years ago, and which has been very useful, I am of opinion that nine out of ten of the entries made in my State were made by men from States east of the Missouri River, certainly by those not residents of what are known commonly as the public-land States.

Mr. Chairman, it is about 30 years ago that Maj. Powell, then at the head of the Geological Survey, suggested what he thought should be the orderly evolution of the homestead theory. He

suggested that in the course of time we would pass from the 160-acre homestead to a larger homestead, as the lands to be taken were poorer in character—less productive—and that finally we would pass to a homestead of 640 or 1,280 acres, or even larger, for the very poor and desert lands of the country.

The first day of the last Congress I introduced what I think was the first general grazing-homestead bill introduced in the House, providing for a homestead of from 640 to 1,280 acres. I am of opinion that it would have been better to have this latitude as to area in a homestead bill of this character rather than confine the entries to 640 acres or less. The Secretary of the Interior, in discussing the matter, suggested the thought that it would be at this time difficult for them to make such an examination of the public lands as would enable them to intelligently judge as to what lands might be properly entered in 640-acre areas, and what lands might be properly entered in larger areas, expressing the opinion held by all who are familiar with the situation, however, that as to some of our lands we will probably go to a still larger homestead entry some time in the future. We passed the enlarged homestead bill, which I had the honor to introduce and report to the House as the first step in the evolution from the 160-acre homestead. In passing that bill we adhered to the farm-homestead idea, to the idea that the homesteader should be a farmer, and our thought was to make it possible to farm on the semiarid lands where farming is carried on under what are known as dry-farming methods. Under that law requiring specific and definite areas of cultivation, and the first homestead law to so require, we have settled very large areas in the West which otherwise would be and which, up to the time of their settlement, were retained in the possession of the great flocks and herds run under grange conditions. I said that was the first step in the evolution. I had forgotten for the time being the step taken some years ago which has been referred to here, applying the grazing-homestead idea to western Nebraska.

We had, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] has stated, a considerable discussion, and there was in Nebraska and elsewhere a long controversy as to what we should do. It was finally determined to try the grazing-homestead idea in western Nebraska. We were able to pass a law and to apply it to a certain definite territory, because in that particular territory there was neither timber nor mineral, and very little land left that was fit for cultivation. It was an area where the remaining public lands were practically all of them available or useful for grazing purposes only, and incidentally for a certain class of tillage for forage crops. The law has worked splendidly, even better than we hoped it would at the time we passed it. Some have suggested that under this 640-acre law, generally applied under the terms of this bill, there may be and there is danger of the gradual bringing together of these areas in very large ownerships. I think there is little danger of that in a harmful way. It is true that as you reach the lands that have a very small productive capacity—and undoubtedly some lands of that character will be taken under this law—there will be a tendency to the consolidation of those entries, and it is possible that in some localities where this law is utilized we shall finally reach a situation where instead of the economic conditions bringing about an average ownership of about 500 acres, as in western Nebraska, we may have an average ownership of considerable more and ownerships in some instances of as high as several thousand acres, but in my opinion as that tendency toward large areas in single ownerships will not go on to any great extent on lands that have any considerable productive capacity. It is common experience that the small stockman can in many cases make better use of these lands than the large stockman. Therefore the tendency is not toward very large areas, but to the reasonable areas used as a home, cared for in such a way as to produce the very largest return. There will, of course, be some localities where the best economy will be found in the consolidation of considerable areas in a single ownership or control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCracken].

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] stated awhile ago, the purpose of this bill is to increase the number of live stock in this country, but I doubt very much if it will serve that purpose in my State. I am inclined to think it will have the opposite effect in many localities, for it will afford an opportunity to some entrymen to make an entry of large tracts of land without any intention of cultivating or improving it, but who merely intend to obstruct the free use of the open range by stockmen. I have known some instances

where men have made homestead entries on lands that were adapted for no other purpose than grazing and who would take the first opportunity to exact tribute from the first flockmasters who came along before he would permit stock to be driven over his land to the summer ranges. Even under the enlarged-homestead act entrymen have been known to deliberately enter lands with but one purpose in view, and that was to fix an arbitrary price for the little grazing privilege which his entry might afford. I do not intend to convey the idea that the enlarged-homestead act has not helped our State, for the fact is that thousands of entrymen have in good faith availed themselves of the privilege which that act affords, and they have increased the wheat yield in Idaho enormously. The little town of American Falls, in the southeastern part of Idaho, has become the second largest primary wheat-shipping point in the world. Rexburg, another town in southeastern Idaho, ranks close this year to American Falls as a wheat-shipping point. For miles around these two towns the farmers are successfully engaged in dry farming, and the larger number of them have made their entries under the enlarged-homestead act. If these people could be served by this act, I should be much in favor of it, but I do not see how it can be of advantage to any large number of people in the arid portion of the State of Idaho; but I can see where the act can be employed to harass and annoy both large and small live-stock owners who are trying to carry on their business in a legitimate way.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. I will.

Mr. NORTON. Why can not these men do the same kind of thing under the 320-acre enlarged-homestead act?

Mr. McCracken. It has been done in some localities.

Mr. NORTON. This will not change conditions, then?

Mr. McCracken. I think the act now proposed will give a larger advantage to the man who does not make his entry in good faith; I am sure it will.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a 320-acre entry was sufficient for his State; that a man can make a living on that land?

Mr. McCracken. Yes; I believe that in most cases 320 acres of land suitable for agricultural purposes will afford the entryman an opportunity to make a living.

Mr. GANDY. If that is true, this will not hurt you a bit, because the 320-acre entry will continue, and a man will only take up those tracts of land where he must necessarily have 640 acres on which to support a family.

Mr. McCracken. The bill proposes to allow the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether or not a given tract of land is sufficient to support a family. I doubt if there is anyone in the office of the Secretary who will be able to promulgate rules and regulations which will make this bill operative and which will distinguish the bona fide entrymen from the man who desires to acquire large tracts of the public domain in order that he might get control of a vast area of grazing land.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. I will.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. How many sheep are there in the State of Idaho?

Mr. McCracken. I am unable to give the gentleman the number as shown by the assessment rolls of 1915, but I am informed that the value of the flocks in Idaho represent nearly \$15,000,000.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In my State they represent as much as 50 per cent of the money taken in, and we have the same trouble there. I am a sheep and cattle man both—

Mr. McCracken. I want to say this, gentlemen, that I have been told by small owners of sheep and other live stock that if this bill becomes a law it will in large part destroy the live-stock industry in my State. Now, I do not think you want to do that, and certainly I do not want to do it. I am not the owner of any kind of live stock, but I want to plead for that which I think is for the best interest of the honest stock owner, who is obliged by the very nature of his business to range his stock upon the public domain during the grazing season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record certain portions of an address delivered by the president of the Wool Growers' Association which relate to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this discussion, I will say that at a recent meeting of the Wool Growers' Association, which was held last December in Boise City, the president of that organization, in his annual address, spoke in part as follows:

The range situation is steadily growing worse from the viewpoint of the woolgrower. Every plan for the disposal of the public lands is an increased area for the settler, whether he can make use of the same or not; a grazing homestead of 640 acres is now the proposal advanced by Congress. This bill passed the House of Representatives during the last session, but failed in the Senate by reason of the adjournment of that body. There is no question but that such a bill will be again introduced. Should it pass, it will mean the end of the range business as we now know it. With the 2-mile limit law in the statute books, the priority-rights case decided against our industry, and the privilege of entering on 640 acres of land extended to all and sundry without any residence requirements or any proof to show they can put such an area to beneficial use, we can readily see our finish.

But this is essentially a grazing country, and such land will eventually revert to be used for grazing purposes, but it will be in the hands of large corporations, who, owning the land, will enjoy privileges undreamed of by the woolgrower of to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the purpose of this bill, but I do not believe it will have the tendency to increase cattle raising in this country. On the contrary, I think the tendency would be to restrict the raising of cattle. I am thoroughly familiar with the territory comprised in the Kinkaid Act, and I know of my own knowledge that previous to the enactment of that act many more cattle were raised upon the territory comprehended therein than have been raised since.

I notice in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, which is before this body, that in stating the increase in cattle he places it in value instead of number.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. REAVIS. I do.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman looked over the statistics in regard to the increase in the number of cattle in Nebraska and in the Western States for the last 10 years as population advanced and as the land has been built up?

Mr. REAVIS. I have not; but I take it for granted, from observation, that the production of cattle upon the range in the West, and especially in western Nebraska, is less to-day than it was 10 years ago.

I argue from the report of the Secretary of the Interior which accompanies this bill, that when he states the increase in volume of the potatoes produced, the increase in acreage of rye, oats, corn, and wheat, on the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid bill, when he further states the increase in the number of horses and the number of hogs, and states only the increase in the value of cattle without stating whether there was an increase in number, that there has been a reduction in the number of cattle, otherwise his report would not have been restricted to value alone. It has been the observation of every man within the sound of my voice that live stock, cattle especially, to-day and in 1914 are worth approximately double what they were in 1904, and the increase in value of the cattle upon the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act, from \$3,176,000 in 1904 to \$4,287,000 in 1914, would argue a decrease in the number of cattle rather than an increase. When this vast territory is divided up into farms of a section each it is no longer devoted exclusively to the raising of cattle as it is when the whole range is open to the great cattle firms. This is shown—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. REAVIS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would it have been possible for the Secretary of the Interior to have told anything about cattle from the taxation books of those counties? What proportion of those cattle that ranged that country at the time you speak of would have shown on the tax rolls of the counties which they range?

Mr. REAVIS. I have no means of knowing, Mr. Chairman, but he had sufficient information to enable him to show the number of horses that ranged on that territory, and the value of the cattle within its limits.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not better to raise one steer that is worth \$100 than to raise three long-horned Texas cattle worth only \$33.50 each?

Mr. REAVIS. The steer that you raise to-day was worth only \$33.25 in 1904. But the reason for the decrease in the number of cattle is that the section taken up by the individual farmer is no longer devoted entirely to cattle raising. In the territory comprehended in the Kinkaid Act I find from 1904 to 1914 the increase in the production of potatoes in that territory was 3,719 per cent.



The increase in the acreage of rye was 92 per cent. The increase in the acreage of oats was 80 per cent, and I might follow the list on down. And the reason, Mr. Chairman, that the cattle produced in that territory, divided as this bill provides, are less in number than formerly, is that the acreage no longer is devoted exclusively to cattle raising, but is now devoted in part to the raising of grain. And yet I favor this bill, because I believe any bill that will offer a home to satisfy the land hunger of the homeless, that will permit individuals to make homes as they have made them in the district of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID], is a good bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Would the gentleman like one or two minutes more?

Mr. REAVIS. I would.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield to the gentleman a couple of minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. I can remember the day, 15 years ago, when I traveled over the territory that was comprehended by the Kinkaid bill, and it was as bleak and as barren a waste as one would ever expect to see in this Nation of ours. You may go to that same locality to-day—opened up to settlement by an act that granted to the settler a section of land; that granted to him sufficient territory to support his family, to rear his children in comparative comfort—and you will see a schoolhouse on nearly every hillside and a church in approximately every valley.

The only reason, Mr. Chairman, that they were constructed there is that this Government enlarged the homestead to an extent sufficient to permit those people to support their families in that locality. And this act will have the same effect. It will open up homes to many to-day who have no homes. I am in favor of it for that reason, but I insist upon the proposition that if you are expecting this act to increase the number of feeder cattle in America you are going to be disappointed in its purpose. It will not do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Also, the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family," and insert the following: "*Provided*, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, this should not be treated as a motion to strike out and insert; but it has two separate purposes—a motion to strike out, and then a separate amendment to insert. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself first to the amendment proposing to strike out the original proviso as found in the bill, as follows:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

Before speaking of that, my colleague on the committee, Mr. KENT, of California, requested me to say that, with this language stricken out of the bill, if present he would vote against the bill. He is absent on account of illness to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this proviso that the committee seeks to have stricken out of the bill, I recognize, of course, that upon its face it would place the discretion of the Secretary within very narrow limits, requiring him upon the one hand to designate land which, in his opinion, 640 acres was

sufficient to support a family, and upon the other side requiring him to exclude from such designation land which, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly would not support a family.

But, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to afford homes for those who desire them. It ought not to be the purpose of anybody—and if it is the purpose of anybody it ought to be prevented, if possible—that any provision of this bill or of any other enlarged-homestead law should be used for purposes of speculation or a hold-up for anybody.

Now, I believe that the Secretary should make express designations of lands that should be subject to entry under this enlarged-homestead law. But, Mr. Chairman, lands—of which there are millions of acres in the West—that can not possibly support a family in tracts of 640 acres ought not to be subject to entry under this law, because, in the first place, the man who does enter is sure to fail. After he has made his improvements and after he has spent his time and his money he will sell out to a stockman for a song, and he would be glad to get the song in that case.

In addition to that the gentleman from Idaho, who addressed the committee a few moments ago, has informed me that the State of Idaho has upon its statute books a law providing that a sheep herder shall not drive his sheep within 2 miles of a homestead. Am I correct in that?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. What does that mean? That means if a man goes out here on this public land, 640 acres of which can not support a family, he will be compelled to abandon it sooner or later and sell out to a stockman, and in the meantime the land within 2 miles of the homestead that he has made can not be used for any purpose by a sheep raiser or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be sufficient in extending the liberality of this Government in a 640-acre homestead law first to exhaust the designations made by the Secretary of the Interior. It is not advisable on any account to allow railroad companies having lines out there to advertise all over the country that there are millions of acres of land open to entry, and have people go out and find that by no possibility the entryman can support himself or his family upon it; and for that reason I believe that provision should be retained in the bill, so that the Secretary, in making his designations, will not guarantee the support of a family, but will give some encouragement at least that the lands under this new law will afford some hope to the entryman that he will be able to make it succeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in what he has just stated. There are very considerable areas in the State which I have the honor to represent in this House, and I know that there are very considerable areas in a number of other States, where it would be utterly impossible for anyone to support a family upon 640 acres of land. It was for that reason that in the bill which I introduced I proposed a larger homestead for lands of that character. But the committee has seen fit to confine its bill to a 640-acre homestead, and I think perhaps, under all the circumstances and conditions, wisely. But in so doing I think the Secretary should be confined definitely in his designations to lands to which this bill will properly and reasonably apply.

In the first place, the Secretary should not designate lands which may be advantageously utilized under the 320-acre homestead law. There are still considerable areas of lands of that character elsewhere, and lands should be cultivated where they may be advantageously. We want lands farmed wherever they may be profitably farmed. This law, which does not require cultivation, should apply only to lands where cultivation is not ordinarily profitable or possible. It should not, however, offer temptation to men to go onto desert winter ranges and by taking up homesteads here and there very largely reduce the value of those lands for range purposes. There might be a case here and there where that would be done in perfect good faith, here and there a case where a home would be established and where the intent of the law would be fulfilled. But there would be many more cases where the homesteader would not benefit and where the benefit to the public generally for the use of the land for range purposes would be very largely reduced. I think the provision is a wise one and should remain in the bill. Under the terms of this bill the agents of the Secretary of the Interior must make careful examination before designation, for that designation, unlike that provided under the enlarged homestead law, is final and conclusive in bringing these lands within the purview of the act.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes the debate close on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of 10 minutes debate close on this amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands on question. Does the chairman maintain that the provision in the beginning of line 7, page 2, of the bill, which is stricken out there, is inconsistent in any way with the provision in italics? Does he maintain that the two provisions are inconsistent?

Mr. FERRIS. No. They are entirely different matters. They are not the same thing at all.

Mr. NORTON. Those two things could be permitted to remain in the bill without inconsistency?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but I really think they ought not to be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not responsible in any way whatever for this committee amendment striking out the language which it is proposed shall be stricken out, although last year I remember, when the bill was up, I poked considerable fun at the committee and at the bill on account of the two provisions in the bill which, if literally construed, would prevent any land from being designated. I see now that they have separated the two propositions. I thought they were to be treated as one amendment. I prefer myself to keep in the bill the language that is proposed to be stricken out, and to keep out of the bill the language that is proposed to be inserted. I do not see any reason, under the second amendment as it is now separated, why anybody should be allowed to go on to these lands until they are designated.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman will recall that some years ago we passed the 320-acre amendment?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the gentleman will also recall, I know, because he keeps up with things, that on March 4, 1915—last spring—we passed a provision making this same thing applicable to the 320-acre homesteads.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. And we are only putting it in here to make this bill in conformity with the law as to the 320 acres. That is the object.

Mr. MANN. I understand, but I do not believe in it at all.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, this language stricken out is another matter altogether.

Mr. MANN. I appreciate that fact. The tendency will be for people to go on these lands where they hope there will be a designation. If the land shall not be subsequently designated, then it is a great injustice to the man who has taken the chance on it. If the land shall thereafter be designated, it is a great injustice to those who have not taken the chance on it, who would have taken the chance if the land had been designated. I do not believe in giving a preference where a preference is not required.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that legislation of this sort will be enacted, and possibly it ought to be, though I do not question at all that sooner or later it will be found that most of this land will be consolidated in large holdings. A man can not make a living by raising stock on 640 acres of land which is not tillable. No man can make a living by grazing stock on 640 acres where he can not raise anything else. You can try it if you want to, but you can not succeed in doing that, because it is contrary to nature, and the result will be that when men try to make a living by raising stock on 640 acres which may raise a little grazing grass but will not raise anything else, they will lose their efforts, their time, some little money, and will sell out to some one who will graze on large tracts of land; and in the end it will pass out of the hands of the Government and go into the hands either of large corporations or individual large holders, where it will be profitable to graze stock upon thousands of acres combined.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, before lands can be designated at all under this act, the department must first find that it is chiefly valuable for grazing and the raising of forage crops, such as silo corn, broom corn, kafir corn, fodder, and so forth. They must next find that the land does not contain any merchantable timber. They must next find that it is not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of supply, and they must then find that 640 acres of land of this character is reasonably necessary to support a family.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—whom I pause at this moment to say is one of the most clear-headed and helpful Members that ever served on any committee or in any House at any time, and to whom I am indebted now and every day for great services rendered me—would further pro-

vide that the Secretary of the Interior shall designate for entry under this act land which, owing to its general character or general condition in his opinion, 640 acres will clearly be needed to support a family.

Now, that forces the Federal Government to do a thing that it can not do. That forces the Federal Government to be an insurer of the thrift, ability, earnestness, and intelligence of men, a thing that no Government and no person can do. Two men enter homesteads side by side. One man is plucky, gingery, determined, industrious, thrifty, and faithful. Another man takes up a homestead on the adjoining section under precisely similar school conditions, water conditions, and soil conditions, everything being identical. Still one fails and the other succeeds. I am afraid if this amendment is agreed to, it will make the Government an insurer that both men will achieve the same result. A thing, in my opinion, totally wanting in practicability and feasibility.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the Reclamation Service they are determining the quantity that will be sufficient to support a family in making their allotments?

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is entirely correct, but in reclamation work the area is small. They have to journey over only a small area, and they can tell from the water conditions and the quality of the water and the quality of the soil more nearly what can be done. But in journeying all over creation, in that wild, unsettled, and barren waste of land which they have out there, I think it would be impossible to do what the gentleman hopes.

Mr. LENROOT. If 1,000,000 acres or 10,000,000 acres are designated under this amendment, does the gentleman think it more likely that the land so designated will offer a better hope to the man who enters upon it than if all the land is thrown open to entry?

Mr. FERRIS. As a westerner who has gone through the thick and the thin, the fat and the lean, of building up a new country, I do not believe in it. I believe the moment the Government says, "This 640 acres will support a family," every real-estate grafter in that community or that State will seize the opportunity to bamboozle the public and will use the Federal Government as a catspaw to accomplish that purpose. I fear that is what will happen.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if ten times as much is opened to entry, as will be opened with this amendment stricken out of the bill, does it not offer just tenfold opportunity to the real-estate grafters?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so, although I do not want to be tenacious about it. This bill was sent to the department, as it is proper that all such bills should be sent there, to get the opinion of the department upon it. Our committee has been criticized good-naturedly and not good-naturedly for having the department draft these bills. That is true. We call in the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office and we get their opinion. We need their help. We appreciate their help and will continue to seek their help. Let us see what the Interior Department think of this. I quote from a letter written December 15, 1915, by First Assistant Secretary Jones, of the Interior Department:

As suggested in my report of April 24, 1914, it is believed that it would be advisable to omit the proviso to section 2—

That is the proviso under consideration—

found in lines 6 to 10, page 2 of the bill, thus leaving to the settler the responsibility of determining whether or not a specific 640 acres of land, designated under this act, would be sufficient for his purposes. Such has been the law and practice under the original and enlarged homestead acts, as well as the act of April 28, 1904, hereinbefore described. If, however, the committee believes some limitation to be essential, the proviso as it now stands is as far as the limitation should proceed.

I really hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman means that he hopes the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, leave it out of the bill. I was technically stating it wrong, but I think the House understands it. To make it clear, I want the committee's action to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on striking out the proviso.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT and Mr. MONDELL) there were 38 ayes and 6 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

At the end of section 2 insert the following:

"Provided, That where any person qualified to make entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated



affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that the land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed; otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "appeal," strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the language proposed to be stricken out by the amendment reads as follows:

The provisions of this section shall also apply to the application of a qualified entryman to make additional entry of unappropriated public land, the area of which, together with his original entry, shall not exceed 640 acres.

As that language now stands it is open to the construction that it is the purpose of the bill to grant to anyone who has made a former homestead entry the right to make an entry under this act to an amount of land, together with the original entry, that would make 640 acres. That was not the purpose of the committee in this amendment, the purpose being only to provide for a preference right to have designation made for those who shall be entitled to make an additional entry.

If this amendment is adopted, I will offer another making it clear that the right of preference shall be given to the original entryman, the one to be entitled under the bill to make additional entries.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if this language was subject to the interpretation which the gentleman from Wisconsin places upon it, I should be opposed to having it stricken out, but I do not think it is subject to that interpretation. It is as a matter of fact an altogether ineffective proposition as it stands, and therefore should go out. Under the decisions of the Land Office for a number of years no one is a qualified homestead entryman under a provision such as this bill contains who has perfected a homestead entry of any size, and up to this time in this bill we have made no provision which would in any way tend to modify the ruling of the department. Therefore, a provision at this point to the effect that the application of a qualified entryman shall be received to make an additional entry would be of no effect, because under the rulings of the department anyone who has heretofore made an entry is not a qualified entryman.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not accomplish the purpose if the word "qualified," in line 3, was stricken out?

Mr. MONDELL. It would. I am in favor of having such a provision and I intended to offer an amendment later.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is in favor of a man who has taken a homestead in a public-land State of less than 640 acres being permitted to take the balance up to 640 acres under this law?

Mr. MONDELL. I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not that be accomplished by striking out the word "qualified"?

Mr. MONDELL. It would be an indirect way, but not a very certain way of accomplishing it. I think it ought to be accomplished directly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It seems to me that if the gentleman considers the other amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin it would obviate any objection he may have.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection. I think the language proposed to be stricken out would not be operative either to accomplish what was intended or what I would like to have accomplished, therefore I think it ought to go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "make," insert the words "original or additional," so that the line will read: "Provided, That where any person qualified to make original or additional entry under the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had supposed that somebody would, and perhaps somebody has, given us a statement about the amount of land entered as homestead in the last few years. I used very often to hear on the floor of the House a statement from gentlemen, sometimes from the West, complaining that all the land that people could cultivate was taken up, and that there was nothing left except land that you had to give away in large quantities in order to get people on it. I have not examined this year the report for last year showing the amount of land patented or entered as homestead.

Mr. LENROOT. I can give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. MANN. For a great many years I have noticed that notwithstanding the statements made to us every year that all of the good lands are gone each year there was more land entered under homestead entries than had been the year before, and since I have been a Member of the House I think more land has been taken under the homestead entry than had been taken altogether in the history of the Government prior to that time, and I am not sure but that in the last 10 years of my service in the House that statement would be true if limited to the 10-year period. I now yield to the gentleman to give me the figures.

Mr. LENROOT. Last year there were 37,343 homestead entries, covering an acreage of 7,180,981.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that is a good deal more than was taken under homestead entries the first year, or the first years, that I came here. How much of that is taken under the 320-acre law I do not know, but all of the land which can be cultivated and support a family, with a reasonable acreage, is not yet gone, any more than have all of the fish yet been taken out of the sea. We are sometimes led to believe that there is no more good land left. Mr. Chairman, as a rule, there never was any good land left. When the people settled in the State of Illinois, even when I was a boy, long after a good many people had settled there, it was said the land was not worth anything. Most of the people thought that you could not raise much crop upon it; and they thought right, for you could not at that time, but they have made it over since. They were not troubled, as a rule, in my part of the country by any lack of water, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think something ought to be said at some point during the consideration of this bill along the lines of the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. It has been made to appear whenever this question is brought up that there is no available land left for homestead entry under present laws, I hold in my hand the last report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and on page 67 of that report he gives the number of homestead entries made and the acreage year by year since the homestead law was passed in 1868. I will put into the Record merely the 10-year periods, so that we may see whether or not, so far as we can gather from entries being made, there is any necessity for the passage of this bill at all. In 1870 there were 4,041 entries, covering 519,727 acres. In 1880 the number increased to 15,441, covering 1,938,234 acres. In 1890 the number of entrymen increased to 28,080, and the acreage to 4,060,592. In 1900 there were 25,286 entrymen and 3,477,842 acres taken. In 1910 the number was 23,253 and the acreage 3,795,862, while in 1915, the figures I gave a moment ago, there were 37,343 entrymen with an acreage of 7,180,981.

So, Mr. Chairman, it does not appear from these statistics that there is any dearth of lands or entrymen as yet calling for the passage of this bill, at least to the extent of saying that there is no land left open for entry under the 320-acre homestead law and that they must be given 640. In the last three years there have been more homestead entries made and allowed by the Land Office and more acres have gone into private ownership under the homestead laws than there were in any five-year period since the homestead law was passed. That merely furnishes a reason why the provisions of this bill ought to be scrutinized pretty carefully and why we ought not to act upon the assumption that we have to indulge in the utmost liberality in order to secure homestead entries upon what is left of the public domain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Since I have been a Member of this House I have frequently heard the assertion made that western Members are continually saying that all of the public lands are taken up that are suitable for homestead entry under existing laws. I have been a Member for five years, and I have never heard any western Member make any assertion of that kind. It has not been made since I have been a Member of the House.

I have heard frequently the western Members say that the good land, that which was irrigable and arable, in a large section of the country was taken up, and that is the fact. I will admit all that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has just said. But that does not prove anything, because he does not tell in what localities that land was taken nor in what sections of the country. There are yet large areas of public land that can be taken under existing law. There are a few States that practically have all that land, and there are other States that have thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres such as is covered by this homestead bill that is before the House to-day.

Now, in my own State we are not so greatly interested in this measure, although we have on river bluffs and in certain localities a lot of this character of land; but I do know from my knowledge of the West that there are in some States thousands of acres, hundreds of thousands of acres, and millions of acres of this kind of land that will make homes for people in time, and that will enable large areas that are now of no benefit to anybody, except a few nomadic stockmen, to come on the tax rolls and becoming taxpaying property and also add to the population of those States. I do not understand that this land is of a character that there can not be an acre of it farmed. I do not think that anyone contemplates that there could not be any of it farmed, but it must be chiefly valuable for stock raising and not for the raising of crops to enable a man to make a living for his family. I think the bill is a wise one. There may be in some cases mistakes made under the law. There has never yet been a homestead law but what there have been some mistakes made; but going on the principle of trying to benefit the greatest number of people, I think that this bill should pass, and that in time, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said, we should enlarge the area. I am not one of those who believe that the nomadic stockman, the man who is getting the benefit of public property for nothing and who has had it that way for 30 or 40 years, should be continued in that privilege in perpetuity or during the rest of the existence of the United States.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer a substantial amendment. Some of us agree here that we might not know much about different characters of land, but we wondered a little about the language in the first sentence of this paragraph.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. What page?

Mr. MAPES. Page 2, section 2. Section 2 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate certain lands, "the surface of which is chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops," and then continues "do not contain merchantable timber," and so forth. What is the subject of "do not contain"?

Mr. FERRIS. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. "Lands" is the subject.

Mr. MAPES. Then the words "and which" should be inserted after the word "crops" in line 3, page 2.

Mr. MANN. "Which" is there.

Mr. MAPES. But it refers to the word "surface."

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. MAPES. "The surface of which is." If that is the subject, then the verb should be in the singular, "does contain."

Mr. FERRIS. I think we are all right.

Mr. MAPES. I do not know which the committee desired to have the subject. If I can find out, I will offer an amendment.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I always hesitate to get into any argument in reference to grammar, and I do so with a great deal of trepidation now. My opinion is that "land" is the subject, and "surface" there relates back to land.

Mr. MAPES. "Lands" is in the objective case, the object of "to designate."

Mr. BORLAND. It is an objective phrase. If the gentleman will yield, it is an objective sentence, an objective phrase, as it is sometimes called.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, in line 3, on page 2, after the word "crops," the words "and which," so that the sentence will read: "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate lands the surface of which is valuable and which do not contain," and so forth. Some such amendment is necessary in order to make the sentence read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "crops," insert the words "and which."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we close debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Of course, I mean after we vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate close on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the gentleman's request? I have an amendment pending which I wish to discuss.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman wish five minutes?

Mr. MONDELL. I think there may be some discussion on it. It is an entirely new division.

Mr. MANN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] that we would not like to enter upon a long discussion to-night, and I think, under the circumstances, there may be something in the House to be taken care of.

Mr. FERRIS. Let us get rid of this section.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest—

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to close debate on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the request?

Mr. FERRIS. On this amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERRIS. Can not we adopt this section?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on the amendment that I offered.

Mr. MONDELL. I have an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject discussed to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BORLAND having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cox, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 407) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be included in the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal, unless it should interfere with the business in hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment for the gentlemen who are asking to extend remarks on the pending bill? Are there any more requests from gentlemen to extend their remarks on the pending bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on Friday immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. FERRIS. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not desire to interfere with this or any other regularly reported bill?

Mr. BAILEY. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks, subject to the regular business of the House, that he be permitted to address the House on Friday next for 40 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, it is very convenient for a Member to make a request so that he knows the very minute when he is going to address the House. As a rule he is lucky if he knows within a week when he is going to do so. I am constantly asked by Members of the House on this side



for time, and I have told them they would have to take chances on the general debate which is coming along on various bills. And unless there is special reason for it I will have to say the same thing to my friend from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object. I have no doubt that he can get in on Friday.

Mr. FERRIS. May I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he might get in on the road bill to-morrow?

Mr. MANN. Or on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, if he is on the job.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 320. An act to authorize the county of Bonner, Idaho, to construct a bridge across Pend Oreille River;

H. R. 775. An act granting the consent of Congress to J. P. Jones and others to construct one or more bridges across the Chattahoochee River between the counties of Coweta and Carroll, in the State of Georgia; and

H. R. 7611. An act authorizing the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., a corporation, to construct and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across what is known as Back River, a part of the Savannah River, at a point between Jasper County, S. C., and Chatham County, Ga.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by this department during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 587); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of receipts from rentals, extension of Capitol Grounds, for the period beginning January 20, 1915, and ending November 30, 1915 (S. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of harbor of refuge at Portage Lake, Manistee County, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 588); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Wickford Harbor, R. I. (H. Doc. No. 589); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hendricks Harbor, Me. (H. Doc. No. 590); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Pagan River and Jones Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 591); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a change in the estimates of this department on page 58 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, under the title "Salaries, office of assistant treasurer at Cincinnati, Ohio" (H. Doc. No. 592); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, reported

the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 46), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 44), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8235) to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CURRY, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 449) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6057) to amend section 14 of the reclamation-extension act approved August 13, 1914, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 48), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OGLESBY, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3042) to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7502) for the relief of Ellis P. Garton, administrator of the estate of H. B. Garton, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1584) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Louis Landram, administrator of William J. Landram, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Albert Greenlaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of Thomas R. Mason, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CAPSTICK, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of C. C. Graham, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 53), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clayton, Jefferson County, N. Y., a brass or bronze cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9210) providing means for assessments against the lands of restricted Creek Indians in drainage district No. 1, McIntosh County, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 9211) to provide for a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lewisburg, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9212) to regulate the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9213) to authorize the Gary Land Co. to construct a bridge across the Grand Calumet River in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 9214) to provide for the municipal collection and disposal of city refuse in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 9215) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908," approved March 4, 1907; and to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9216) to amend sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON: A bill (H. R. 9217) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Warrenton, Ga., two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and a suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9218) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dike on South Slough, Lane County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 9219) to provide for the acquisition, ownership, and operation by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of all the street railroads located in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9220) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to place on the firemen's pension roll of the District the names of certain persons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 9221) for the relief of mail contractors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9222) to increase the compensation of certain employees of the Government Hospital for the Insane, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9223) for the purpose of preserving life at sea, etc.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9224) providing for an increase in number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9225) granting the consent of Congress to Georgia Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Flint River, Ga., between Dooly and Sumter Counties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 9226) to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric light and power within the Lihue district and the Koloa district, county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9227) to prohibit the receipt of money by internal-revenue officials of the United States in payment of special taxes by dealers in intoxicating liquors, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9228) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896," approved February 28, 1895; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 9229) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands for the use of the Seminole Indians of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9230) to authorize the erection of a monument at Fort Seybert, W. Va., to commemorate the capture and massacre of Capt. Seybert and a number of men and women at that point and in the South Fork and South Branch valleys of the Potomac by the noted Indian chief, Kill Buck, and his band of Indian warriors in the year 1758; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 9231) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, amending section 913 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to annual payments by the Honolulu Gas Co. (Ltd.), under its franchise, of a per centum of its gross annual receipts; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9232) authorizing the extension of Kenyon Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9233) authorizing a survey of Tangipahoa River, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 9234) appropriating money for the improvement of the Allegheny River, Pa., from Tarentum, Pa., to East Brady, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9235) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 94) amending paragraph 7, Rule XXIV, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 95) for the relief of the widow of Junius B. Holloway, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GANDY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 105) providing that hereafter no tribal funds belonging to any Indian tribes shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) providing that hereafter no tribal funds of any Indians shall be expended without specific authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Memorial from the Legislature of California, favoring Federal aid for indigent nonresident tuberculous patients cared for in hospitals which conform to the hygienic standard established by the United States Treasury Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, to standardize the treatment of tuberculosis in the United States, to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of the Legislature of California, favoring Federal legislation in aid of indigent tuberculous persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9236) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9237) granting an increase of pension to George Garrard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9238) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Waltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9239) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting a pension to Clara Woomer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9241) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9242) granting a pension to Helen Swan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9243) for the relief of August Schultz; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9244) for the relief of Jacob Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9245) granting a pension to Charles B. Montgomery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9246) granting a pension to Mary Sheridan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9247) granting a pension to Mariette Hathaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9248) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Thomas B. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9250) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9251) granting an increase of pension to John H. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9253) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Stierwalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) to correct the military record of James Flint; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) to correct the military record of Martin All; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Ordway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Comerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Joseph H. Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 9259) granting a pension to Rosetta Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 9260) granting a pension to Edith Barcia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Culhan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Harland R. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9263) for the relief of John N. Shiltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 9264) granting a pension to Peter Kanuk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9265) granting a pension to Emma F. Bonesteel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9266) granting an increase of pension to Harlow Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to William H. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9268) granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9269) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cooke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9271) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 9272) granting an increase of pension to Levi R. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 9273) granting a pension to John W. Roderick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9274) granting an increase of pension to Maria M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9275) granting an increase of pension to James Hutson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9276) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9277) granting a pension to Nellie M. Tillman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9278) granting a pension to John C. Pearson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9279) granting a pension to Frazier Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9280) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 9281) granting an increase of pension to Narcissa N. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9282) granting a pension to Lewis J. Crider; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9283) granting an increase of pension to Pollis Blon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9284) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9285) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Shumaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 9286) to correct the military record of William B. Johns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9287) granting a pension to Martin Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9288) providing for the refund of certain duties illegally levied and collected on acetate of lime; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9289) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Loomis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 9291) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Mellon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Maris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9293) granting a pension to Robert Chestnut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9294) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Perine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9295) granting an increase of pension to Minnie M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9296) for the relief of Walter W. Parker for overtime work in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9297) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Dovel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9298) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9299) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9300) granting a pension to Martha Provo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9301) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ormsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 9302) granting a pension to Sidney W. Ackerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 9303) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9304) granting a pension to Myrtle Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9305) granting an increase of pension to John Schwoebel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9306) granting an increase of pension to William H. Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9307) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9308) granting a pension to Emelia McNicol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9309) granting a pension to Anna Bryson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9310) granting a pension to Charles W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9311) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9312) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9313) granting a pension to Anna Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9314) granting an increase of pension to John A. Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany House bill 6938, for relief of William C. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9143, for relief of Mary F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of sundry merchants of Kansas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Weyauwega, Wis., favoring woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of E. R. Hayhurst, favoring House bill 476; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. T. Russell, favoring the Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of Standard Bleachery Co., of Carlton Hill, N. Y., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs in United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 8119, for the relief of Mary E. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of F. W. Thurston Co., of Chicago, favoring the Hill bill, H. R. 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., urging prompt passage of House bill 702, relating to the dyestuff situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petition of the Winsted Hosiery Co., favoring bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Guardian Savings & Trust Co., of Cleveland, Ohio., protesting against stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. M. Pattison Supply Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 50,000 members of the German-American Alliance, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on war munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Woolen Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEATON: Memorial of Washington Camp, No. 84, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ashland; Clinton W. Shearer and S. B. Edwards, of Pottsville, Pa., relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ribber Manufacturing Co., of Pottsville, Pa., favoring passage of bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Hockannin Mills, of Rockville, Conn., favoring passage of a bill to protect manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petitions of business men of Murfreesboro, Petersburg, Lewisburg, Smyrna, Manchester, Shelbyville, Fayetteville, and Tullahoma, Tenn., favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Capt. Santwein and all other officers and enlisted men of Company C, First Infantry, National Guard of Missouri, favoring passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Melklejohn Co., of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lymanville Co., of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bill protecting manufacturers of dyestuffs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Albany, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Milaca, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Eden Valley, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Rice, Minn., urging legislation requiring mail-order houses to pay taxes in sections where they dispose of goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Memorial of Branch 108, Paving Cutters' Union of United States and Canada, Willards Point, Me., favoring law preventing importation of foreign-made paving blocks to be sold at prices below reasonable cost of production in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, N. Y., favoring adequate measures to prevent shipping congestion; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. D. Pierce, of Pine City, N. Y., favoring a uniform divorce law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of Religious Society of Friends, of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Neutrality and Peace Convention, relative to violation of neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Traffic Club of New York and Philadelphia Bourse, favoring repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of sundry banking and trust companies of Texas, favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry business men of the State of Texas, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of veterans of the Confederate Army, favoring law granting pensions to widows and minor children of Confederate veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Woman's Missionary Society of Colorado, Tex., protesting against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Toledo (Ohio) Scale Co., against passage of House bill 150, to regulate weights and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Baraca class of the Tabernacle Baptist Church, of Utica, N. Y., favoring law censoring moving-picture films; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring assistance to relieve conditions relative to the congestion of freight at railway terminals in United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the fixing of railway-mail pay by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petitions of Local Union 682 and District No. 2, United Mine Workers of America, protesting against military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of District No. 23, United Mine Workers of America, and Kentucky State Federation of Labor, asking that the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations be printed in full; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of the Boulder Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 651, as fair to both shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast enabled us out of various kindred peoples and tongues to erect a great empire dedicated to exact and equal justice and to the freedom of all. We bless Thee for the privileges of freedom. We come to Thee continually that we may be taught that higher liberty wherewith Thou dost make men free. Give to us the Divine inspiration that a conscience quickened by Divine wisdom may rightly decide all the issues of life. Give us the power by that spiritual appropriation that we may not be bound in the prison house of a merely sensuous intellect. God grant to lead us in the realm of the higher and eternal, that we may perform our functions not only as citizens of this state but of the higher kingdom. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator elect from Idaho, is in the Chamber and desires to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho will present his colleague at the Vice President's desk that the oath may be administered to him.

Mr. BRADY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. BORAH, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him.

SAN FRANCISCO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, at yesterday's session of the Senate my colleague [Mr. PHELAN] had printed in the RECORD some matter relating to the Hetch Hetchy grant. I was very earnestly opposed to the grant at the time the bill was before the Senate, because, in my judgment, the city of San Francisco did not need the water and it was needed by the owners of land in San Joaquin Valley, as it would irrigate hundreds of thou-